THE PROCEEDINGS
of
The South Carolina Historical Association
1993

Officers of the South Carolina
Historical Association
1992-1993

President
Charles H. Lesser
South Carolina Department of Archives and History

Vice-President
Denis G. Paz
Clemson University

Secretary-Treasurer
William S. Brockington, Jr.
University of South Carolina at Aiken

Exective Board Members

Peter W. Becker
University of South Carolina at Columbia

Terry L. Helsley
Rock Hill School

Maria G. Synnott
University of South Carolina at Columbia

THE PROCEEDINGS
of
The South Carolina
Historical Association
1993

Peter W. Becker
Editor

The South Carolina Historical Association
The University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC

It is the policy of the South Carolina Historical Association to publish all papers presented at the Annual Meeting. The editor of the *Proceedings* disclaims any responsibility for the scholarship, statements of fact and opinion, and the conclusions of the contributors.

CONTENTS

HOW VARIOUS AND CONFLICTING: COMMUNITY THERAPY FOR INSANITY IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY SOUTH CAROLINA

Peter McCandless
College of Charleston

In 1828 South Carolina opened a state lunatic asylum which its founders hoped would soon become the place of first resort for the treatment of the insane. But for various reasons many of the insane long continued to be cared for at home or in other community settings. The officers of the state asylum routinely deprecated non-asylum care. They feared that the insane would receive no treatment or, worse, the wrong kind of treatment. In the asylum's report for 1842, physician Daniel Trezevant lamented that community practitioners persisted in employing drastic depletive therapy for insanity, despite mounting evidence that it was both ineffective and deadly. "Talk of madness," Trezevant wrote, "and you have the lancet, drastic cathartics, emetics, etc., etc. instantly presented . . . It is a very mistaken idea that Insane Patients bear the extremes of treatment with impunity. There is no mistake more generally made, and unfortunately for them none more fatal."[1]

The heroic therapies that Trezevant denounced were inflicted on many of the insane who received non-asylum care in nineteenth-century South Carolina. But it would be a mistake to assume that general physicians invariably resorted to bleeding and purging when faced with a case of mental disorder. Moreover, physicians were not the only ones who treated the insane. Numerous irregular practitioners offered cures of their own,while many people resorted to domestic or self-help medicine.

To determine how insane persons were treated in the community setting is no easy matter. Medical literature of various types can establish the general outlines of therapeutic

[1]South Carolina State Hospital, *Annual Report* (hereafter *AR*), 1842, 19-21.

theories and principles, but it rarely tells us what happened in practice. Most local records relating to community care of the insane do not reveal what medical treatment, if any, they received for their mental disorder. The patient records of the South Carolina Lunatic Asylum sometimes provide information about treatment previous to commitment. But often all we learn is that the patient had received some unspecified medical treatment. Some patient records mention specific therapies, but not who provided them, or where, or to what extent: others state that the patient had been treated by a physician, but not how.[2]

There is no simple way to explain why an insane person received a particular form of treatment -- or no treatment at all. Therapeutic decisions were not the reflexive result of medical theories or principles, but the outcome of a complex and dynamic interaction of medical, economic, racial, cultural, and social variables. Physicians and their ideas and experiences often played a dominant role in these decisions. But families, friends, irregular healers, public officials, and the insane themselves could all influence what therapies, if any, might be selected in a given case. Family members or patients might be skeptical about the physician's diagnosis or his remedy. They might not share the doctor's physicalist explanation of the disorder, and might prefer to rely on spiritual, magical, or folk remedies. The insane themselves often played a role in determining the degree and types of treatment they received by refusing to submit to bleeding or drugs. One patient admitted to the state asylum refused to take any medicines because, she claimed, Jesus Christ told her not to.[3] Faced by a patient who adamantly resisted medical treatment, physicians often hesitated to use force to achieve their object, for fear that they might aggravate the disorder.[4] Inadequate or uncooperative nursing often abetted a patient's opposition to a particular therapy. One exasperated physician reported in 1885 that his attempt to treat a patient had been "entirely unsatisfactory as he refuses to take any medicines and the nurses [are] unable to use force [and] cannot follow directions. . . ."[5]

Nineteenth-century general practitioners were often in a weak position when called in to deal with a case of insanity. Few of them had much knowledge about insanity or experience in treating the insane. Many physicians, especially in the early part of the century, had not had any formal medical education, but were trained by the apprenticeship method, if at all. Others had attended one of the many inferior medical schools that emerged during the antebellum period. Until the last part of the century, the curriculum of even the better medical schools did not provide regular or systematic instruction in psychiatry. The community practitioner was not totally at a loss when faced with a case of insanity. He could consult colleagues for advice or turn to a medical treatise or journal for help. Many general medical texts provided a section on insanity, while specialized treatises

[2]The patient records are of three types, and are cited as follows: South Carolina State Hospital, Patient Treatment Record (hereafter PTR); South Carolina State Hospital, Commitment Papers, (hereafter CP), South Carolina State Hospital, Case Histories (hereafter CH). All are located in the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia.

[3]Mr. A. Coward to Mrs. C. H. Jenkins, March 19, 1987, Micah Jenkins Papers, South Carolinana Library (hereafter SCL); CP, no. 4443; CH, 29, no. 14370.

[4]Thomas Moore, "On Mania," medical thesis, 1829, Medical College of South Carolina, 13; Charleston Commissioners of the Poor, Minutes, April 14, 1850, Charleston City Archives.

[5]CP, nos. 4487, 4265, 4307, 4358, 4369, 4479, 4561, 4962, 5107, 6966, 7010, 7036, 7156, 3029; CH, (15), no. 7706.

on the subject proliferated during the nineteenth century. But not all practitioners would have taken the trouble to read the books and journals; some may have been unable to buy them. Moreover, the assistance received from these sources was often contradictory, and was as likely to confuse as to enlighten. "How various and conflicting are the directions which [the general practitioners] meet!" Daniel Trezevant declared.[6]

The gamut of directions was wide indeed. During the early nineteenth century, it ran from Benjamin Rush's bloody medical interventionism to the "masterly inactivity" of Philippe Pinel, which emphasized moral (psychological) therapy. The two approaches were not mutually exclusive. Rush advocated moral remedies such as occupation and amusement, and Pinel recommended the occasional use of purges and sedatives. But the advice of Rush and Pinel represented the extremes of therapeutic practice. Phnel's less activist approach was adopted by many antebellum asylum superintendents, but it was one thing to employ moral techniques within the confines of an institution designed for the care of the insane and another to implement them in a domestic setting. The community practitioner was often faced with a violent patient who was tied down in bed or shut up in a small room. A medical professor like Eli Geddings of Charleston might exhort his students to imitate the "bright example" of Pinel and anoint "the poor Lunatic's sorrowed heart" with "the healing balm of your tender sympathies."[7] But met with a family's demand to do something effective quickly about a severely disturbed patient, the community physician was likely to opt for drastic medical action of some kind.

The therapies that community physicians employed upon insane patients altered subtly and slowly during the course of the century. These changes, which involved a gradual retreat from the heroic therapeutics that held sway at the beginning of the nineteenth century, reflected broader developments in medical therapeutics generally. During the first third of the nineteenth century the influence of Benjamin Rush was at its height. Many South Carolina physicians had trained under Rush in Philadelphia, and his medical system had numerous devotees in the state. Rush's theories attributed most diseases, including insanity, to vascular inflammation, for which he invariably prescribed anti-inflammatory or anti-phlogistic measures: bleeding, along with the powerful purgatives calomel and jalap, comprised the centerpiece of Rushian therapeutics.[8] Rush advocated particularly massive bleeding in acute mania. He claimed that he had taken hundreds of ounces of blood from insane patients over a period of months with wonderful results. Bleeding was to be followed

[6]*AR*, 1842, 19-20; Charleston *Courier*, Jan. 6, 1838, Jan. 16, 1841, *Charleston Mercury*, June 4, 1839; William C. Miller, "Remarks on Insanity," medical thesis, Medical College of South Carolina, 1845, Waring Historical Library (hereafter WHL); Norman Dain, *Concepts of Insanity in the United States, 1789-1865*

[7]Eli Geddings, *Valedictory Address to the Graduating Class of the Medical College of the State of South Carolina*, (Charleston, 1852), 20; Thomas G. Morton, *The History of the Pennsylvania Hospital*, (Philadelphia, 1895), 148-150; Evelyn A. Woods and Eric T. Carlson, "The Psychiatry of Philippe Pinel," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, (1961), 35: 14-25. For examples of the influence of moral treatment ideology on future general practitioners in South Carolina, see Moore, "On Mania," 14-16; N.W. Herring, "Delirium Tremens," medical thesis, 1841, Medical College of South Carolina, 18-19, both WHL.

[8]David Ramsay, *History of South Carolina* (Charleston, 2 vols., 1809), 2: 116-120; Joseph I. Waring, "The Influence of Benjamin Rush on the Practice of Bleeding in South Carolina," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* (1961), 3: 230-237; Medical Society of South Carolina, Minutes, June 1, 1805, WHL; Benjamin Rush, *Medical Inquiries and Observations upon the Diseases of the Mind*, (Philadelphia, 1827), 14-25, 183-189.

by purging, blisters, and a low or spare diet consisting of the "least nutritious" vegetables. From the adulation that David Ramsay and other South Carolina physicians heaped on Rush, as well as other evidence, it is likely that many of them adopted his therapeutic approach to insanity.[9] Dr. Thomas Y. Simons, a prominent Charleston physician who wrote a short treatise on insanity in 1828, recommended bleeding to lessen "vascular action" and alternatives like calomel and tartar emetic to "restore the organs to their appropriate and healthful functions.[10] According to Thomas Moore, a student at the Medical College of South Carolina who wrote an inaugural thesis on mania in 1829, the "first remedy" in cases of insanity was bloodletting, followed by cathartics and low diet.[11]

Yet it would be misleading to conclude from these examples that community practitioners in the early nineteenth century always resorted to massive bleeding and drastic purging in cases of insanity. Medical treatises usually advised the practitioner to reserve the most drastic treatments for the most acute, severe or furious forms of insanity. Physicians who urged the effectiveness of heroic remedies often hedged their advice about with various limitations and cautions. Much of the therapeutic literature of the time warned that it was necessary to consider the nature of the malady, the condition of the patient's system, and the constitutional idiosyncrasies of the patient before deciding upon the exact course of treatment to follow. In his thesis, Moore stressed that bleeding was strongly indicated when the patient's pulse was "full and pretty strong," and he possessed a "sanguineous temperament." Bleeding might be useless or harmful when the patient was in a physically debilitated or low state. As a general rule, the physician should cease bleeding after three repetitions if no improvement occurred. Moore advised similar discrimination in the use of purgatives and other remedies. Such cautions were standard features of many medical treatises of the early nineteenth century.[12] Moreover, for the treatment of milder nervous disorders, such as hypochondriasis or hysteria, treatises usually advised physicians to employ more moderate medical means, along with psychological treatments such as travel, cheerful company, riding, amusements, outdoor exercise, and light but nutritious diets.[13]

Although Rush had a great influence on the treatment of insanity in the early nineteenth century, his therapeutic ideas did not command universal respect. Many American physicians questioned the single-mindedness (as well as the bloody-mindedness) of his medical system. For example, South Carolina's Dr. J. L. E. W. Shecut announced in 1819 that he had largely abandoned mercury as "a dangerous remedy" and had given up bleeding in yellow fever. Shecut became a proponent of electrical therapy in many diseases,

[9]David Ramsay, *An Eulogium upon Benjamin Rush, M.D.*, (Philadelphia, 1813), vi-vii, 41-46.

[10]Thomas Y. Simons, *Observations on Mental Alienation and . . . Medical Jurisprudence*, (Charleston, 1828), 22-25. On Simons, see Joseph I. Waring, *History of Medicine in South Carolina*, (Columbia, S.C.: South Carolina Medical Association, 3 vols., 1964-1971) 2: 295.

[11]Moore, "On Mania," 11-13; J. Rice Roger, "Dissertation of Insanity," medical thesis, Medical College of South Carolina, 1846; W. Agnew, "An Inaugural Dissertation on Insanity," medical thesis, Medical College of South Carolina, 1846.

[12]Moore, "On Mania, " 10-12; see also, A. W. Higgins, "Diseases of the Mind," medical thesis, Medical College of South Carolina, 1854.

[13]Henry D. Holland, "An Inaugural Dissertation on Melancholia and Hypochondriasis," medical thesis, Medical College of South Carolina, 1829.

including several mental and nervous disorders, such as melancholia, hysteria, hypochondriasis, and epilepsy.[14]

By the 1830s and 40s some American physicians were openly questioning the efficacy of traditional therapeutic activism. Boston's Jacob Bigelow wrote of "self-limited diseases," and argued for a more supportive therapeutics that would assist the "natural" process of recovery. But growing skepticism about the theory and principles of traditional therapeutics did not lead American physicians suddenly to abandon traditional remedies in practice. For practical and professional reasons most American practitioners continued for decades to rely to a greater or lesser extent on the old therapies. Change was cautious, gradual and uneven. Country practitioners, often poorly trained and isolated from new ideas, were generally slowest to change. But physicians everywhere were reluctant to abandon heroic measures totally, partly because they had nothing as impressive to put in their place. As Charles Rosenberg has argued, traditional therapeutics appealed to physicians and laymen alike because both groups tended to share the ancient concept of the body and its functioning upon which they were based. According to this concept, disease was not so much a specific entity as a general state of the body, a lack of internal balance or equilibrium. Medicine was largely a business of attacking symptoms and restoring internal harmony, and it did this mainly by regulating the secretions through drugs, bleeding, counter-irritants, etc.. The continuing appeal of traditional therapies lay in their visible physiological effects; they seemed to "work" in the sense that they altered bodily states, often in dramatic and predictable ways. It was difficult for physicians to abandon such powerful weapons, especially since so many patients or their families expected or demanded them.[15]

Many South Carolina physicians seem to have adopted this moderate, gradual approach to therapeutic innovation in the treatment of insanity and other disorders. One can see the trend in the writings of Samuel Henry Dickson. A highly respected professor at the Medical College of South Carolina from the 1820s to the 1850s, Dickson helped train many of the state 1820s physicians. He also wrote substantial medical texts such as *Pathology and Therapeutics* (1845) and *Elements of Medicine* (1855), both of which discussed the treatment of insanity. Dickson recommended traditional therapies and issued the usual cautions about the need to prescribe according to the state of the patient's general system and condition. His therapeutic recommendations, like those of many other American physicians, tended to become more moderate over time. In 1845 he noted that some physicians considered general bleeding in insanity to be useless or even harmful, but that he "should not hesitate to bleed freely" in acute cases marked by a flushed complexion, rapid pulse, headache, and outrageous behavior. Ten years later he declared that bleeding was

[14]J. L. E. W. Shecut, *Medical and Philosophical Essays*, (Charleston, 1819), 128, 237-238, 257.

[15]Charles Rosenberg, "The Therapeutic Revolution: Medicine, Meaning, and Social Change in Nineteenth Centrury America," in Morris J. Vogel and Charles E. Rosenberg, eds., *The Therapeutic Revolution: Essays in the Social History of American Medicine* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1979) 5-20; John Harley Warner, *The Therapeutic Perspective: Medical Practice, Knowledge, and Identity in America, 1820-1885* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986) 17-36; John S. Haller, Jr., *American Medicine in Transition* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1981), 85; John Duffy, *The Healers: A History of American Medicine* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1979), 99-103; William G. Rothstein, *American Physicians in the Nineteenth Century* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1972), 62.

"much less frequently and energetically employed now than formerly, and is not often, perhaps, requisite or beneficial." For patients in a low or weakened state, Dickson stressed the importance of supportive measures designed to build up bodily strength: warmth, nutritious and agreeable diet, and a moderate use of tonics and stimulants.[16]

Dickson's therapeutic advice reflected changes occurring in American medicine generally. The therapeutic practices of community physicians in South Carolina succumbed in time to the same trends. Evidence concerning the medical treatment of the insane in the antebellum community indicates a continuing reliance upon traditional therapeutics, but with a gradual trend towards moderation in their use. The antebellum patient records of the South Carolina Lunatic Asylum indicate that community physicians employed drastic depletive therapies in the 1830s and 40s. For example, Allen Griffin, who came to the South Carolina Lunatic Asylum in 1829, had been "largely bled" prior to admission. When Stephen Monk arrived at the asylum in 1836, Dr. Trezevant noted that "he had been bled freely and kept low and much prostrated.[17] The physicians of Mrs. Georgia Robert, who was admitted in 1844, bled and cupped her, cut her hair short, and administered various purges and emetics, including calomel, rhubarb, nitre (saltpeter), and tartar emetic.[18]

Mrs. Robert was the wife of a planter. But the records of the Charleston poor house indicate that the insane poor often received the same treatments, if not the same degree of attention.[19] Insane slaves were also subjected to heroic therapies, since many masters employed regular physicians or were themselves medically trained. Ironically, one of the most detailed antebellum case histories of community medical care in antebellum South Carolina is the case of a slave named Joe, who resided on a plantation near Charleston. When Joe became insane in 1846, his owner brought him to town and placed him under Wragg's care. Wragg treated Joe with repeated bleeding, blistering, purging, and hot foot baths with mustard. After nine days of this treatment failed to restore Joe to rationality, Wragg put a seton in the back of his neck. Once the seton began to suppurate (discharge pus), Joe's delirium began to subside and within a few weeks his mind was again "perfectly clear."[20]

It is difficult to know how typical Joe's treatment was, as few descriptions of the medical treatment of insane slaves have survived. Other physicians asked to treat a case of insanity in a slave may have been less--or more--heroic in their approach than Wragg. Some antebellum southern physicians held that blacks possessed certain physical "peculiarities" which required a distinctive approach to therapeutics, and that treatments that worked well on whites might be ineffective or positively dangerous in the case of blacks. Advocates of

[16]Samuel Henry Dickson, *Pathology and Therapeutics* (New York, 1845), 381-382; idem., *Elements of Medicine* (Philadelphia, 1855), 652. On Dickson, see Waring, *History of Medicine in South Carolina*, 2: 222-226. For similar views, see Higgins, "Diseases of the Mind," 30-31; William Veitch, "Remarks On Insanity," medical thesis, Medical College of South Carolina, 1857, 19-20, 27.

[17]PTR, 1, Allen Griffin, Stephen Monk, PTR, 2, Densby Dorn. See also, PTR, 1, Andrew Stephension, Rebecca O'Neall, John King; PTR, 2, Susan Dawson, T. H. George, Mary Couterier.

[18]Letter from Mr. Robert re Mrs. Georgia Robert, 1844, at end of PTR, 3; PTR, 2, Georgia Robert.

[19]PTR, 2, Walter McKlintock; CCP, Minutes, May 21, 1829, Jan. 1844, Nov. 23, 1846, April 14, 1850, Dec. 17, 1852, Feb. 2, 1853; South Carolina State Hospital, Superintendent's Reports to the Regents, Feb. 25, 1854, South Carolina Department of Archives and History.

[20]W. T. Wragg, "Remarkable Case of Mental Alienation," *American Journal of Insanity* (1846), 3: 67-72.

a "negro medicine" sometimes argued that the black man, in consequence of his "underdeveloped" nervous system, did not require and did not bear bleeding and other drastic therapies to the same extent as the white. Yet other southern physicians claimed that the "inferior" organization of the black meant that he needed and could tolerate larger dosages of some medicines than the white man.[21]

By the middle of the century, community practitioners in South Carolina were gradually reducing their use of drastic depleting measures in cases of insanity, and making greater use of supportive and sedative means. The gradual abandonment of bleeding was the most radical change. During the later antebellum period physicians began to use it less often and less drastically, and by the 1880s they had virtually given it up altogether. A measure of the change of sentiment about bleeding is revealed in the commitment paper of a patient admitted to the asylum in 1884. According to her physicians, one of her delusions was that "[she] fancies the only way to relieve her condition is by bleeding."[22] Other traditional depleting therapies lingered on longer than bleeding, especially among rural practitioners. Moreover, the gradual abandonment of bleeding was to some extent balanced by an increased use of sedative drugs such as the bromides, chloral hydrate and morphine. These were often followed by tonics containing iron, quinine, and alcohol. General practitioners of the late nineteenth century often combined old and new therapies in an eclectic fashion, hoping that something would work. They might use chloral with calomel, bromides with blisters, morphine with mercury.[23]

Regular physicians were not the only ones who treated the insane. Out of choice or necessity, families faced with insanity often resorted to home remedies or irregular practitioners of various kinds.[24] Help and advice from these sources was abundant, but like that emanating from the physicians, was often contradictory and confusing. Domestic medical manuals proliferated during the nineteenth century; several were published in South Carolina.[25] Most manuals provided advice on some mental or nervous disorders. The

[21]Kenneth F. Kiple and Virginia H. King, *Another Dimension to the Black Diaspora: Diet, Disease, and Racism* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1981); 178-179; John S. Haller, Jr., "The Negro and the Southern Physician," *Medical History* (1972), 16: 243-248.

[22]CP, no. 4221. On the decline of bleeding for insanity during the antebellum period, see Samuel Thielmann, "Madness and Medicine: Trends in American Medical Therapeutics for Insanity, 1820-1860," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* (1987), 61: 25-46; for the decline of bleeding in American medicine generally, see Leon S. Bryan, Jr., "Bloodletting in American Medicine, 1830-1892," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* (1964), 38: 516-529).

[23]CP, 3108, 2806, 3516, 4271, 4450, 4692. See Dain, *Concepts of Insanity*, chapter six, for discussion of how general practitioners' treatment of insanity changed during the later nineteenth century.

[24]Elizabeth B. Keeney, "Unless Powerful Sick: Domestic Medicine in the Old South." in Ronald L. Numbers and Todd L. Savitt, *Science and Medicine in the Old South* (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1989), 276, 281-282; Paul Starr, *The Social Transformation of American Medicine* (New York: Basic Books, 1982), 67-69; E. Don Herd, Jr., *The South Carolina Upcountry, 1540-1980* (Greenwood, S.C., 1981) 243, 247-248; Martin Kaufmann, *Homeopathy in America: The Rise and Fall of a Medical Heresy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1971), 15-16; James Cassedy, "Why Self Help? Americans Alone with their Diseases, 1800-1850," in Guenter B. Risse, et. al., *Medicine Without Doctors: Home Health Care in American History* (New York: Science History Publications/USA, 1977), 31-39.

[25]William Buchan, *Domestic Medicine*, (Charleston 1807); Anon., *The Medical Vade Mecum* (Charleston, 1800); J. Hume Simons, *The Planter's Guide and Family Book of Medicine*, (Charleston, 1848); Alfred M. Folger, *The Family Physician*, (Spartanburg, S.C., 1845); Simon Abbott, *The Southern Botany Physician*, (Charleston, 1844); John Gunn, *Gunn's Domestic Medicine*, (facsimile of the first edition, Knoxville, 1830, published by the University of Tenn. Press, Knoxville, 1986, with an introduction by Charles E. Rosenberg); James Ewell, *The Medical Companion, or Family Physician*, (8th ed., Philadelphia, 1834); Joseph Laurie and Robert J. McClatchey, *The Homeopathic Domestic Medicine* (New York, 1872); *The Cottage Physician*, (Springfield, Mass., 1895). On the literature and practice of domestic medicine in the

manuals often recommended moral as well as medical remedies. Several manuals advised the importance of gaining the patient's confidence by a mild demeanor, and diverting his thoughts through agreeable exercise, employment, or travel.[26] Most manuals recommended supportive measures such as tonics, nourishing diet, and stimulants for weakened patients, hysterics, or hypochondriacs. A few emphasized drastic depletive remedies, particularly in cases of acute mania. To cope with a patient furious from "Inflammation of the Brain, or Phrenzy" J. Hume Simons advised,

> Bleed immediately, and let the blood flow until the patient is sick at his stomach. If he is not relieved by one bleeding, bleed again and again, from time to time. Cut the hair short, or shave the head, and apply a bladder half full of cold water, with a piece of ice in it, if it can be had. . . . If he is a grown person, give him 10 grains of Calomel, 12 and four hours afterwards, a dose of Epsom or Glauber Salts - less for a child etc.. Cup the temples, or put leeches to them. Remember the bowels must be kept open. . . . Put a blister on the back of the neck, and keep putting them on as soon as the place heals, throughout the course of the disease. . . . Be careful to keep the room dark and quiet.[27]

Albert Folger's *Family Physician* (1845) recommended calomel for most mental and nervous disorders, but then he recommended calomel for almost everything.[28] The remedies the manuals prescribed were often similar and changed little over long periods of time. In the 1890s *The Cottage Physician* recommended therapeutic regimes for insanity and hypochondriasis similar to those found in eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century manuals.[29]

People trying to cope with mental disorder at home without a physician were not restricted to manuals and other written advice. Numerous irregular practitioners stood ready to help. The absence of effective licensing in South Carolina, especially after 1838, allowed irregular practitioners of all kinds to flourish. Sometimes they were organized medical sects, such as the Thomsonians, who emphasized botanical remedies. The Thomsonians, named for Samuel Thomson of New Hampshire, had strong popular support

nineteenth century, consult Elizabeth B. Keeney, "Unless powerful Sick: Domestic Medicine in the Old South," in Numbers and Savitt, *Science and Medicine in the Old South*, 276-294; Risse, et. al., *Medicine Without Doctors*. On the use of the manuals for the care of the insane see Samuel B. Thielmann, "Community Management of Mental Disorders in Antebellum America," Journal of the History of Medicine (1989), 44: 351-374.

[26]Abbott, *Southern Botany Physician*, 281-283, 236-239; Buchan, *Domestic Medicine*, 276-279, 290-291; Ewell, *Medical Companion*, 480-490; *Cottage Physician*, 190-191.

[27]Simons, *Planter's Guide*, 100-101; Ewell, *Medical Companion*, 120, 125; Buchan, *Domestic Medicine*, 290.

[28]*Cottage Physician*, 190-191, 206-207.

[29]*Cottage Physician*, 190-191, 206-207.

in South Carolina during the 1830s and 40s.[30] South Carolina Thomsonians established their own journal, the *Southern Botanic Journal*, in Charleston in 1838. Thomsonians violently attacked the therapies of regular physicians, including their treatments for insanity, as useless and murderous. But Thomsonian practices were in some respects remarkably similar to those of the regulars. Thomsonians tried to sweat disease out of their patients with steam baths and cayenne pepper, and scoured out clogged digestive systems with botanical emetics and purgatives such as the powerful lobelia. The aim, as one disciple put it, was "to infuse fresh vigor into the system, remove obstructions, and promote healthy secretions.[31] Thomsonians used these methods to treat insanity as well as physical disorders. A Virginia correspondent of the *Southern Botanic Journal* in 1839 described how he had successfully treated a maniac slave with lobelia.[32] By the late 1840s Thomsonianism began to decline as a movement, but the vogue for botanical medicine remained strong for decades as can be seen from numerous newspaper advertisements for vegetable remedies.[33]

In addition to the medical sects, many people continued to place faith in the power of folk practitioners of one kind or another, some of whom had the reputation of having occult powers.[34] An example is the practice of "using," which German immigrants brought to the state during the eighteenth century. Using retained adherents in central South Carolina at least into the early twentieth century. Practitioners of using would rub the affected part of the patient's body, blow their breath upon it, and repeat ancient charms and incantations. Among the remedies that have survived is the following one for epilepsy: "Take a new broom and sweep from three corners of a room. Throw the sweepings over the person who has the sickness, while you say these words: *In God's name, Falling Sickness, you must depart till I these seed do cut*. So do it three times." Like most forms of alternative medicine, using thrived on both faith and skepticism. One practitioner who defended using argued that it was just as effective as prayer, since the names of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were always invoked. If it did no good, she continued, at least it could do no harm, "and in this respect it differs from the drugs used by physicians."[35]

The ranks of the irregulars included numerous black herbal practitioners and root doctors who provided an alternative medicine for blacks and, sometimes, for whites as well. Some of the black folk healers dealt exclusively in herbal remedies; others employed occult means, often referred to as conjure, hoodoo, or root. Blacks, like whites, were often skeptical of the abilities of regular physicians. Many plantation slaves understandably preferred the folk doctor's concoctions, even those containing boiled cockroaches or sheep's

[30]Waring, *History of Medicine in South Carolina*, 2: 95, 100, 114-116; Joseph F. Kett, *The Formation of the American Medical Profession: The Role of Institutions, 1780-1860* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), 17-23, 111-112; Barnwell County, Session Journal, Nov. 4, 1817, SCL; *Charleston Mercury*, May 25, 1836; Rothstein, *American Physicians in the Nineteenth Century*, 145-147.

[31]*Southern Botanic Journal*, 1839), 2: 27-28. On the Thomsonians, see Alex Berman, "The Thomsonian Movement and its Relation to American Pharmacy and Medicine," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, (1951), 25: 405-408; Duffy, *The Healers*, 110-112; Ronald L. Numbers, "Do it Yourself the Sectarian Way, in Judith Walzer Leavitt and Ronald L. Numbers, *Sickness and Health in America* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978), 87-89.

[32]*Southern Botanic Journal*, (1839), 2: 27-28, 396-397; Dain, *Concepts of Insanity*, 161.

[33]Dain, *Concepts of Insanity*, 161-164.

[34]Herd, *South Carolina Upcountry*, 243; Kaufmann, *Homeopathy in America*, 15-16; Waring, *Medicine in South Carolina*, 2: 114-116.

[35]John Hawkins, "Magical Medical Practise in South Carolina," *Popular Science Monthly*, (1907), 165-168, 172, copy in SCL.

dung, to the painful and debilitating therapies of regular medicine.[36] Some planters tried to eliminate this alternative medical system, others overlooked or even encouraged it.[37] Often the local African folk doctor was also the plantation nurse, who practised both white and black medicine. It was not uncommon for planters and other whites to consult black healers when sick, and to learn black herbal lore from them.

The popularity of folk practitioners among blacks did not derive solely from the negative image of white medicine. Root doctoring or conjure was appealing for cultural reasons, because it was connected with traditional African religion. The methods of the root doctors or conjurers often involved a great deal of ritualism, which combined incantations and charms designed to add supernatural aid to the natural properties of the herbal remedy. Given the faith many people had in the powers of root doctors, they may have functioned effectively at times in combatting mental troubles whose origins were psychological or psychosomatic. But there was a negative side to the conjurer's work. According to those who believed in conjure or hoodoo, the practitioners could cause as well as cure sickness through their charms and spells. Among the disorders the conjurers had a reputation for both inflicting and curing was insanity.[38] Believers in conjure often held that a disease caused by conjuring could only be cured by conjuring.[39] Many patients admitted to the state asylum around the turn of the century claimed that they had been conjured, hoodooed, or bewitched.[40]

Those seeking to cure insanity at home had yet another alternative to regular medicine: proprietary or patent medicines. By the early nineteenth century Americans had established a flourishing patent remedy industry. Throughout the century, newspapers and journals were full of advertisements for proprietary remedies which claimed to relieve or cure a variety of mental or nervous problems. In the 1840s Moffatt's Vegetable Life Pills and Phoenix Bitters promised to cure "hysterical affections, hypochondriacism, restlessness, and many other varieties of the Neurotical class." In the 1870s Hulmboldt's Extract Buchu guaranteed relief to "Nervous and Debilitated Sufferers," and warned that if left untreated, the symptoms of these conditions would lead to insanity, epilepsy, or imbecility. In the 1890s Manetic Nervine combatted "nervous Prostration, Fits, Mental Depression, Softening

[36]Rawick, *American Slave*, 2: 24, quoted in Kiple and King, *Black Diaspora*, 170.

[37]Drew Gilpin Faust, *James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), 81-82.

[38]For general discussion of black folk medicine and conjuring on the nineteenth-century plantation, see Eugene Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1974), 221-230; Charles Joyner, *Down By the Riverside: A South Carolina Slave Community* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press), 144-153; Elliott J. Gorn, "Black Magic: Folk Beliefs of the Slave Community," in Numbers and Savitt, *Science and Medicine in the Old South*, 295-326. Root medicine continues to be viable in the South Carolina Low Country in the late twentieth century. See J.E. McTeer, *High Sheriff of the Low Country*, (Beaufort, S.C.: Beaufort Book Co., 1970); Wilber H. Watson, ed. *Black Folk Medicine*, (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1985); Faith Mitchell, *Hoodoo Medicine*, (n.p.: Read, Cannon, and Johnston, 1978).

[39]CH, 25, no. 12340.

[40]In the case histories of the South Carolina State Hospital between 1877 and 1913, I found at least 37 cases of patients who claimed to be the victims of conjure, spells, hoodoo, voodoo, witchcraft, etc. Of these, 12 were white, 24 black, and one could not be identified by race. See Ch, 3-31.

of the Brain, causing Misery, Insanity, and Death."[41] The large number of advertisements for vegetable remedies reflected both the influence of the botanic doctors and an aversion to calomel and other powerful mineral remedies.[42]

The patent remedies themselves often contained powerful purgatives, opium, or large amounts of alcohol. But this did not stop their makers from exploiting the public's distrust and fear of regular medicine. Advertisements frequently stressed how much less painful and dangerous remedy X was compared to regular therapies. Yet the advertisers also spoke the well-understood language of traditional therapeutics. They sought to assure potential clients that their remedy would restore the internal balance by regulating the secretions. For example, advertisements for Dr. Benjamin Brandreth's Vegetable Universal Pills, which claimed to cure nervous diseases, referred to mercury as a poison and proclaimed that "Calomel is not Used. . . . The Brandreth Pills are made entirely of Vegetable extracts, known by long experience to be perfectly innocent." Yet, in the same breath, the puff added that the purgative power of the pills was greater than that of any other medication. The reason for this apparent contradiction was obvious. Many people skeptical of the specific remedies of the regular physicians accepted the ancient wisdom of the humoralists about the need to cleanse the system. Brandreth claimed that his medicine was designed to "purify, and remove by its purgative powers all bad humors from the blood by the stomach and the bowels."[43]

Anyone could readily purchase patent remedies as well as the most powerful generic drugs by mail, from peddlers, merchants, or physicians. Antebellum planters often purchased medicine chests containing medications such as calomel, quinine, opiates, and various "powders" and proprietaries which they, their wives, or oversees used to treat their slaves and their families. Throughout the century, many people employed "kitchen physic," concocting their own medications from recipes in manuals or other sources.[44] The mother of a patient sent to the South Carolina Lunatic Asylum in 1894 wrote that she had treated him for years with a home-made tonic which combined corn whiskey, quinine, and citrate of iron. She had also given him two courses of Dr. Pierce's medicine, two quart bottles of extract of nettleroot, and Koenig's Nerve Tonic. The home remedies reported on the commitment papers of late-nineteenth century patients included calomel, laudanum, opium, morphine, bromides, chloral, camphor, asafoetida, quinine, blistering, and whiskey.[45]

It is difficult to determine the impact that the various forms of irregular medicine had on the treatment of insanity, because their practitioners' therapeutic efforts seldom left much trace. At the very least, the success of the irregulars added an extra reason for

[41]*Charleston Mercury*, Jan. 3, 1840; Charleston *Courier*, Oct. 2, 1870; Columbia *State*, Dec. 6, 1895.

[42]Charleson *Courier*, May 30-June 1, 1824, Jan. 3, 1850, Jan. 31, 1860; *Charleston Mercury*, Jan. 2, 3, 12, 1839, Jan. 3, 1840; *Charleston City Directory*, 1852, 217; Columbia *State*, Dec. 4-7, 1895. For the history of proprietary medicines, see James Harvey Young, *The Toadstool Millionaires: A Social History of Patent Medicines in America Before Federal Regulation* Princeton University Press, 1961.

[43]Charleston *Courier*, Jan. 3, 11, 1839. On Brandreth, see Young, *Toadstool Millionaires*, 75-89.

[44]Keeney, "Unless Powerful Sick," 287-288; Louis Manigault, Prescription Book, 1852, Charleston, South Carolina, Medicine given to slaves at Gowrie Plantation, Ms. Dept, Perkins Library, Duke University; Charleston *Courier*, Jan. 3, 1839.

[45]CP, nos. 6952, 69993, 7099, 4953, 5088, 5098, 5171, 11981; CH, 9, no. 4705, 17, no. 8697, 19, nos. 9715, 9732, 20, n0. 10118, 21, nos. 10883, 10969, 22, no. 10930.

regular physicians to move away from drastic therapeutics. Although some of the irregular remedies were positively dangerous, the folk healers and sectarians often did little harm, and may even have produced some benefit.[46]

Community therapy for insanity in nineteenth-century South Carolina was indeed "various and conflicting." The victims of mental disorders might be subjected to a bewildering array of treatments, regular and irregular, medical and magical; or, to no treatment at all. Therapeutic choices were influenced by a host of social, economic, cultural, geographical, racial, and medical circumstances and attitudes. Many people could influence the kinds of treatment ultimately adopted, including the patient, his family, friends, owner (in the case of slaves), regular and irregular healers, nurses, and local officials. Yet there was a certain consistency and continuity within this apparent therapeutic chaos. Physicians, both regular and irregular, might differ widely about theories of insanity and the best means to combat it. But in practice they often tended to use similar remedies and sought to achieve much the same goals. As in other diseases, they generally agreed that treatment should be directed towards regulating bodily secretions and restoring the body's natural internal balance. The means by which they sought to accomplish these aims changed slowly during the nineteenth century, as physicians gradually abandoned bleeding and drastic purging. Yet old therapies persisted in modified forms, partly because that is what patients and their families expected. The lay public, regardless of whether it was skeptical about the regulars, shared many of their assumptions about mental disease and its treatment. This is reflected in the writings and advertisements of the medical sects and the patent remedy sellers, who emphasized the ability of their treatments to regulate secretions and restore proper bodily functions. Ironically, the irregulars capitalized on both the public's skepticism towards and its acceptance of regular medicine to secure a significant role in the treatment of insanity in the community.

[46]Duffy, *The Healers*, 122; Dain, *Concepts of Insanity*, 160.

SOUTH CAROLINA'S COLD WARRIOR: JAMES P. RICHARDS, CAPTAIN OF AMERICA'S INTERNATIONAL "FIRE DEPARTMENT" DURING THE 1950'S

Joseph Edward Lee
University of North Carolina, Charlotte

There they were, two of America's most vigilant Cold Warriors. Clad in shirtsleeves on a hot June afternoon, tobacco wads strategically placed inside their cheeks, feet propped atop the Lancaster, South Carolina, farmhouse porch rails, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, son of a Presbyterian minister, and James Prioleau Richards, grandson of a circuit-riding Presbyterian clergyman, discussing the righteous cause, the battle against godless international Communism, the struggle which placed the world of the 1950s on the brink of Armageddon[1]

Richards' credentials as a front line soldier in the crusade against the red devil stretched back nearly fifteen years before that June 1955 Lancaster meeting. In November 1941, on the eve of the nation's participation in another type of crusade, Richards, a junior member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, vigorously argued against President Roosevelt's request to revise the Neutrality Act in order to allow United States merchant ships to sail, armed, into war zones. Comrades of the beleaguered Soviet Union, which desperately needed American aid, lambasted the South Carolinian.[2]

The New York Communist Party's *Sunday Worker* blasted the Congressman's position on Neutrality Act revision. Richards was called "The official leader of the group of

[1]Interview with Lavoy Banknight, Lancaster, S.C. 11 November 1989; Banknight, a professional photographer and friend of the congressman's, was called to the farm to photograph Dulles and Richards; the author appreciates Mr. Banknight making photographs of the meeting available; Richards once wrote to his fellow Cold Warrior Dulles, "If you need any snuff or chewing tobacco, let me know. It is good to combat pressure," James P. Richards to John Foster Dulles, 4 April 1958, James P. Richards Papers, University of South Carolina Caroliniana Library, Columbia, S.C. (hereafter referred to as Richards Papers); the Presbyterian background of Richards and a genealogy of his family is analyzed in my "'America Comes First With Me': The Political Career of Congressman James P. Richards," Ph.D. diss., University of South Carolina, 1987.

[2]Richards' break with FDR over the 1941 Neutrality Act is chronicled in the *Congressional Record*, 77 Cong. 1 sess., 8771-73; he lost that battle, 212-194; Richards usually supported the president, as we see in Jack Irby Hayes, Jr.s' "South Carolina and the New Deal, 1932-1938," Ph.D. diss., University of South Carolina, 1972, 150 which places Richards' support of Roosevelt at 71%.

reactionary Southern Democrats" who broke ranks with their Commander-in-Chief. The newspaper derided Richards' "old fashioned, spread-eagle speech," but a constituent sent Richards a copy of the publication's reaction and scribbled across the article the observation "When the Communists go after you, I know you are all right."[3]

Richards knew that his suspicions of Communist intentions were indeed "all right." After the conclusion of World War II, Richards, now a senior member of his committee, forged the relationship with Dulles which would be so important in the Eisenhower years. Despite the two men's different political party affiliations, there was uniformity in their views toward the Soviet Union as the Communists reneged on their pledge to allow Eastern Europe freely to determine its own path in the post-war world. After scanning a 1946 *Reader's Digest* article by Dulles in which the Republican warned "The methods which the Soviet leaders use are repugnant to our ideas of humanity and fair play," Richards exchanged letters with the foreign affairs specialist. The Democrat called the article "splendid, to the point, and I concur in everything you said." Dulles replied immediately, thanking the South Carolinian for his compliments and pledging to keep in touch in the future.[4]

Dulles' turn at the foreign policy helm, of course, was nearly seven years in the future. As the decade of the 1950s dawned, Richards had to work with Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and the relationship was sometimes rocky. Acheson, Richards told an interviewer in the mid-1960s, had an irritating tendency to be condescending in briefings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Throughout the Truman administration's tenure, Richards attempted to remind the secretary of state that the House, as well as the U.S. Senate, deserved consultation in matters of foreign policy. As one national newspaper commented "When the Administration has completed work on its . . . foreign aid program, Richards will expect to be consulted.[5]

And there were, in the 1950s, many crises that required consultation. In the last year of the previous decade, the Soviets had unlocked the secrets of the Atomic Bomb, and Communist forces had shoved Chiang Kai-shek off the coast of mainland China. Richards, on the threshold of assuming the chairmanship of his panel, worked with Acheson to persuade Congress to approve a $150,000,000 aid package for Syngman Rhee's Korea, the Asian outpost on the frontier between Communism and Democracy. A few months later time ran out for the South Koreans as North Korea, equipped with Soviet-made weapons and backed by the Chinese Communists, crossed the 38th parallel. The menace to international peace was clear, and Richards did not hesitate to do battle with the villain. As

[3]Robert W. Hemphill to Richards, 16 November 1941, Richards Papers; Hemphill, a Chester, S.C. attorney, succeeded Richards in the U.S. House in 1957, representing North Central South Carolina in Congress.

[4]*Reader's Digest*, August 1946; Richards to Dulles, 19 July 1946, Richards Papers; Dulles to Richards, July 23, 1946, Richards Papers; Richards' own critical view of the Soviets were apparent in his distribution to educators in his district of a House document entitled "Communism in Action," see Henry R. Sims to Richards, 21 June 1947, Henry R. Sims Papers, Winthrop College Department of Archives and Special Collections, Rock Hill, S.C.

[5]Interview with Richards conducted by Richard D. Challender, 23 September 1965, Lancaster, S.C. Copy in John Foster Dulles Oral History Project, Princeton University Library, hereafter referred to as Challender; *Washington Post*, 13 May 1951.

he wrote to a Greenville, S.C, physician, "The Communists must be stopped somewhere and we may just as well begin in Korea.[6]

The Korean conflict, as we know, developed rapidly into a stalemate. Some of Richards' constituents placed blame on Truman and Acheson. One wrote to the Congressman that "[the two men] will never lead us out of this debacle which they have gotten us in." Richards was more muted in his reaction to the Korean quagmire. When Truman removed General Douglas MacArthur from the command of American troops in Korea in April 1951, Richards labeled the firing "inevitable" and commented that there was only room for one commander-in-chief under the American system. Additionally, the South Carolinian refused to blame Acheson for the quicksand of Korea. Fighting what he perceived to be Soviet-orchestrated Communism was, to Richards, a noble cause, and he urged Acheson's Democratic critics to quiet their dissatisfaction and settle their differences "in the family.[7]

As Richards assumed the chairmanship of the Foreign Affairs Committee in May 1951, there was no doubt about Richards' desire to challenge the Communists even if such challenges could deteriorate into stalemates like Korea. As he wrote to a Rock Hill, S.C. resident, "Communism is our deadly enemy and must be combatted at every turn." The neutrality of a decade earlier had evaporated. The guilty nation had been indicted, tried, and convicted, and Richards wished to inflict capital punishment; as he told a reporter, "The center of Communism is still Moscow, not Peiping." He added that he had no "illusion about ever trying to get along with Communism and the Russians unless we are strong." The emphasis, obviously, was on military strength. Richards stressed to the reporter that "if we are going to stay out of the big fight-I mean out of another world war-we have to stay strong."[8]

Without delay Richards steered through Congress the Mutual Security Act of 1951, a measure designed to offer military, economic, and technical aid to America's allies. Over $5,000,000,000 was earmarked for nations such as Greece, Turkey, and Iran. Beleaguered Korea and the rest of Asia were allotted $530,000,000.[9]

It would be in error to assume that Richards, in his zeal to combat Communism, freely distributed cash to any nation which held out its palm for assistance. When the Truman administration requested nearly $8,000,000,000 in foreign aid in 1952, Richards told his committee that he had learned how to identify "dead wood," and he expressed his determination sharply to reduce the administration's request. After seven weeks of debate, the Mutual Security Act of 1952 was passed. The administration's original solicitation was reduced to under $6,500,000,000, the lion's share, at Richards'insistence, destined for

[6]House Foreign Affairs Committee's *Hearings on H.R. 5330, Aid to Korea*, 81 Cong., 1st sess., 1950; for Richards' support of Korean aid, see *New York Times*, 9 May 1951 and *Washington Post*, 13 May 1951; even though Richards was not chairman at the time of the Korean aid measure the committee's chair called him "deputy chairman" and delegated responsibility for steering the bill through the House to Richards, John Kee to Richards, 12 January 1950, Richards Papers; Richards to Thomas Parker, 29 June, 1950, Richards Papers.

[7]I. B. Clontz to Richards, 4 January 1951, Richards Papers; John E. Peurifoy, 23 April 1951, Richards Papers; Richards to W. C. McDow, 30 May 1951, Richards Papers.

[8]Richards to I. B. Clontz, 8 January 1951, Richards Papers; Rock Hill *Evening Herald*, 9 May 1951.

[9]*H. R. 5113*, "Mutual Security Act of 1951," 82 Cong., 1st sess.

Europe, the front line against Soviet Communism. Some of the aid was sent to Spain's Francisco Franco, because, as Richards told a crowd during his campaign for re-election in 1952, "We want air fields in Spain to have planes close enough to shower bombs on Russia should she move against us. . . ."[10]

The Republican Party's victory in the 1952 election toppled Richards as chairman of his committee, but brought Dulles to power as Eisenhower's Secretary of State. Dulles, unlike his Democratic predecessor, did not patronize the Foreign Affairs Committee. Richards solidified his relationship with Dulles and remarked some years later that he was on a first name basis with "Foster." He marveled at Dulles' "great mind" and said that as the two men mapped Cold War strategy "I got to love him, and so did my family."[11]

During the summer of 1953 Richards joined Dulles at the United Nations. The South Carolinian returned from two weeks attending the U.N.'s Eighth General Assembly more convinced than ever that America was locked in a fierce battle with a foe determined to destroy the American way of life. Although he did not advocate American withdrawal from the international body, the legislator feared that the U.N. would be hamstrung by Soviet intransigence.[12]

It is clear that the two leaders' anti-Communist fervor bound them together in the battle against Soviet encroachments. Even though Richards spent the 83rd Congress as leader of the minority Democrats, his clout with Dulles was not diminished. The two political figures watched in horror as early in 1954 the French, despite a large infusion of American aid, wre outwitted by Southeast Asia's Communists and were being besieged at Dien Bien Phu. France's impending collapse, like the fall of Chiang Kai-shek's regime, the detonation of a Soviet atomic bomb, and the Korean bloodbath sent the same message to Dulles and Richards. The villain was Moscow, and Richards sounded the alarm with his assertion that "The Russian government seeks to overthrow our form of government and destroy our way of life."[13]

On May 7, 1954 French forces capitulated to the Communists. Dulles sought increased aid for non-Communists elements in that region. Richards pledged his support for this policy and wrote to the secretary that "You are making a great fight against many obstacles and have my support in the position you have taken." Dulles responded "Your very generous statement of support is particularly encouraging since it comes from one whose judgment and counsel I value so much." Later that month the two men traveled to the University of South Carolina to receive honorary degrees. While in the state, Richards took Dulles to the Lancaster County farm and later recalled "I never saw a man so enjoy getting away from . . . public life."[14]

[10]*Washington Post*, 7 March 1952; "Survey of Activities of the Committee on Foreign Affairs House of Representatives, Eighty-Second Congress," (Washington, 1952), 39-40, Copy in the Library of Congress; *Lancaster News*, 9 July 1952.

[11]Challender.

[12]*The State*, 28 July 1953; Ibid., 29 July 1953.

[13]Richards to Howard W. Yates, 28 August, 1953.

[14]Richards to Dulles, 10 May 1954, Richards Papers; Dulles to Richards, 12 May 1954, Richards Papers; Challender.

The vacation was a brief one for the two Cold Warriors. Dulles returned to Washington to sort through the Asian mess, and Richards won re-election to another term, his twelfth, in Congress. Soon the lawmaker regained his chairmanship of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Touring Asia in late 1954, Richards seemed sobered by the defeat of the French.

He observed that perhaps the majority of Vietnamese might actually prefer a Communist government. The Congressman had detected the folly of supporting anti-Communist forces in a region which, as a result of its poverty and its heritage of oppressive colonialism, might not want democracy as he knew it. Richards' cautious warning that America should choose its battles with Communists carefully, however, would be ignored. The rice paddies of Southeast Asia would soon trap America just as they had earlier engulfed France.[15]

As the South Carolinian began his second term as chair of his committee, the ease with which Richards worked with Dulles was evident. With the Nationalist Chinese refuge of Formosa being bombarded by Mao Tse-tung's artillery in January 1955, Richards guided the administration's Formosa Resolution through Congress. The measure authorized Eisenhower to send military force if necessary to defend the island against Communist aggression. Some years later, Richards explained the legislation as informing "Red China to keep hands off Formosa." Coordinating his strategy with Dulles, Richards remembered that "My admiration for him grew all the time." Understandably the Soviet Union's *Pravda* assailed Richards' support for Chiang Kai-shek. That paper editorialized that the South Carolinian "seems to be in a hurry to join the list of candidates for future trial as a war criminal."[16]

Even though he was immersed in committee business, Richards found time to continue his discussion of the evils of Communism. College students were a prime audience for the chairman to lecture about the threat posed by the Soviet Union. In April 1955 he spoke at Presbyterian College. The legislator argued that "as long as the Communists agitate and prod and foment revolutions around us, there are going to be fires to be put out. The United States fire department is the only one powerful enough to do it or to place the fear of God in the hearts of those who set these fires." America's "fire department" must he ever-ready, the Congressman told another South Carolina college's student body because "If we are to survive, we must remain strong; Russia respects only strength."[17]

Richards' rhetoric drew praise from citizens outside his native state. A Pennsylvanian wrote to Richards in May 1955 that "we all love you for your manly good sense regarding Russia and the terrible shell game she is playing." The chairman had witnessed the "shell

[15]List of Richards' Study Missions, Richards Papers; *New York Times*, 14 December 1954; Richards again warned about Vietnam in his 1965 interview with Challender.

[16]Lanelle Willoughby Bethea, "The Richards Mission to the Middle East, 1957," M.A. thesis, Wintrop College, 1969, 21-22; Challender; the *New York Times* applauded Richards use of "southern charm and cloakroom horse-trading" in helping pass the Formosa Resolution, 26 January, 1955; *H. J. Nes.* 159, 84 Cong., 1st sess. is the resolutin; *Charlotte Observer*, 16 February 1955.

[17]Copy of speech delivered by Richards at Presbyterian College, 29 April 1955, Richards Papers; speech delivered at Erskine College, 30 May 1955, Richards Papers.

game" at the United Nations, but he was willing to allow the Soviets to use this forum for voicing their views. If such a concession to the Communists reduced the possibility of armed conflict between the superpowers, Richards would not favor efforts to withdraw from the U.N. As a summer press release explained, "Through such an organization, some day, somehow, men of good will will sit around a great international conference table and settle their differences. There is no other way to preserve, in this atomic age, civilization as we know it." We see, therefore, the emergence in the mid-1950s of a pragmatic and sane side to Richards' position on combatting Communism. Nearing the conclusion of his career, the South Carolinian saw the Russians' use of the United Nations for propaganda dissemination as preferable to an atomic Armageddon.[18]

Dulles, one can say, was "chief" of America's "fire department." He zealously directed his crew members, like James P. Richards, from international hot spot to international hot spot. Richards, however, was on the front line, and it was the South Carolinian who, feeling the searing heat, realized that resources for extinguishing Communism must be used cautiously. Such was the lesson Richards learned from his 1954 mission to Southeast Asia.

We see Richards at his most realistic in his final months as an officer of America's "fire department." In early 1957, after retiring from Congress, Richards was called from the pleasures of his farm to tour the Middle East to garner support for the Eisenhower Doctrine, an effort to neutralize the influence of Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser, whom Dulles considered a Communist stooge. Returning from a 30,000 mile, fifteen-nation mission, where he was briefly held hostage in Yemen, heard lectures on the sins of Israel, witnessed the poverty of Ethiopia, and was snubbed by Jordan's King Hussein, Richards told the American people that the strategic Middle East was firmly linked to the United States and that there were no wayward states poised to succumb to "international Communism." In a private meeting with Eisenhower and Dulles, however, Richards confided "the Lord only knows what's brewing underneath the surface. Any of them [Middle Eastern countries] could explode at any moment."[19]

The South Carolinian had caught, perhaps, a glimpse of how easily nationalism can be confused with Communism, how rival factions can complicate America's international relations, how economic inequality can shove countries into turmoil, how non-western countries, whether they be Iran or Vietnam, can ensnare the United States. By the end of his career, the southern Cold Warrior grasped the fact, which seems to have eluded Dulles, that numerous factors and numerous villains, not solely the Soviet Union, combined to make the Middle East and the entire world such a perilous place for America's "fire department" to patrol.

[18]Marshall Gray Jones to Richards, 10 May 1955, Richards Papers; press release by Richards, 21 June 1955, Richards Papers.

[19]A thorough study of Richards' Middle East Mission is found in the author's paper on the subject, *Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association*, (Aiken: University of South Carolina, 1988), 103-12; Challender.

COMMUNISM VS. SEGREGATION: EVOLUTION OF THE COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Joyce Johnston
University of South Carolina, Columbia

In April 1958 the General Assembly of South Carolina passed a bill that established a Committee to Investigate Communist Activities Within the State. Creation of this investigative force is primarily attributable to the demands and political push of one man, though the general feeling of need for a committee itself is representative of 1950's Cold War fears of suspected homefront communist activities and of increasing Soviet power.

Governor George Bell Timmerman, Jr. was the basic driving force behind development of the committee, though hardly the only advocate in South Carolina for such a vigilant, if not vigilante, organization. No evident was found to doubt the sincerity of Timmerman's much expressed wariness of communist activity as a menace to America, yet questions remain over what portions of the citizenry and what traditions the Governor believed were most threatened by purported communist activity.

It is the purpose of this paper not only to detail the creation of the Committee to Investigate Communist Activities and its first years (1958-1963) of operation, but also to examine the foundation for its creation. Governor Timmerman was defiantly segregationist; his attitudes, especially reprehensible in an elected official today, were not uncommon to his times. Yet linked and intermixed with his racial views were fears that clandestine, subversive agencies and persons would use the disturbed social situation in the South to foster their own agenda. Timmerman strongly connected the racial upheaval in the South of the 1950's with presumed communist activities there. This paper also examines how Timmerman dealt, or failed to deal, politically with what he perceived as threats to South

Carolina's state rights and traditional (segregated) society, and how his outlook portended his eventual demand for the Investigative Committee.

Timmerman's 1955 campaign for governor reflect his, and a portion of his white constituents', determination to retain a segregated society. His campaign and later public remarks greatly center on the "problem" of possible school integration. *Brown vs. the Board of Education*, the Supreme Court 1954 decision declaring segregation of public schools unconstitutional, was distressing and divisive concern in the south. In a campaign flyer Timmerman is quoted as saying, "Educational opportunities for the children of both races will be best promoted by . . . each race . . . attend[ing] their own schools. . . ."[1] It was a theme that Timmerman pursued with monotonous rhetoric during his term as governor.

At his inauguration, amidst much public acclaim, Timmerman expounded upon his resolve for segregation in South Carolina. "Loyal South Carolinians," he concluded, "will stand firm against any organized [i.e. Supreme Court/Federal] effort to destroy the right of parents to choose what is best for their children." His efforts were appreciated by some members of the South Carolina legislature; Senator L. Marion Gressette endorsed the new governor's address. The possible integration of schools was referred to as "one of the gravest [issues] faced by the state government in modern times."[2]

There is evidence, in Timmerman's surviving elective files and in newspaper editorials and letters of the period, that many South Carolinians supported the new governor's views, with varying degrees of intensity and eloquence. Reflecting on problems in the north, notably in New York City, which ostensibly stemmed from school desegregation, the *Charleston News and Courier* editorial section of December 1957 claimed that the "blackboard jungles" of the north came about from white teachers trying to handle black students. The editorial continued:

> "If only . . . people [in cases of assigning teachers to 'difficult schools'] would follow the path of least resistance, by doing what comes naturally and allowing each race to train its own young people, the most vexing aspects of the race problem in public schools would disappear."[3]

A letter printed in the *Charleston News and Courier* from a Reverend J. F. Moseley declared that the reason the United States lagged behind the Soviets was that "the present administration was so busy with taking away the rights of American citizens under the guise of Civil Rights. . . ."[4]

Timmerman, in a series of form letter answers to correspondence from South Carolinians and from citizens of other states, stood "four-square" against integration and

[1]George Bell Timmerman, "For Governor" flyer, prepared, published, and distributed by the friends of George Bell Timmerman, Jr., 1955, vertical files, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

[2]*The State* (Columbia), 19 January 1955, 1-A.

[3]*Charleston News and Courier*, 1 December 1957, 16-A.

[4]*Charleston News and Courier*, 25 January 1958, 3-A.

considered the traditional segregated system of South Carolina to be the best system.[5] He did, in his campaign and later in his ill-starred attempts at circumventing the Supreme Court, advocate a way around the judicial desegregation order. His plan called for establishment of three types of schools--white only, black only, and mixed race. Parents could send their children to the school of their choosing;[6] by this means, a segregated society would most likely be preserved, and, to Timmerman, the "dangerous innovations . . . [of] the judicial authority to interpret the law crown[ing] the [Supreme Court] with an indisputable right to change the law"[7] would be thwarted.

Some correspondence to Timmerman was virulently racist and segregationist; yet many citizens advocated moderate means of easing into integration, such as gradual increase of mixed school enrollments, if it was absolutely necessary. Others held that there was a distinct bond between federal rulings, school desegregation, and subversion. One letter of September 6, 1957 from a Mr. Joseph E. Lally, Sr. said the Civil Rights Bill, and the school bill were "great stepping stone[s] toward Moscow rule of America."[8]

Another letter to Timmerman of September 28, 1957 details the answer that a Mr. Charles C. Garrett gave to Mr. Aubrey W. Williams (editor of the journal *Farm and Home*), who wrote to Garrett promoting the Supreme Court school rulings. Garrett blasted Williams for attempting to convince the South to "swallow everything the Warren Court prescribes as 'social medicine' for our school system."[9] Garrett identified and denounced Williams as a defender of Communist rights and as a member of the Southern Conference for Human Walfare, which he broadly suggested was a subversive organization. Williams' interest, according to Garrett, was not in the South, but really in the larger service of the Communist Party. The attached copy of Timmerman's response to this letter is expressive; the governor applauded Garrett, exclaiming "You did a splendid job on him."[10] Timmerman's own views increasingly connected subversive activity with the social changes he so much disliked.

Governor Timmerman made persistent attempts to avoid integration through lawful means; examples include his refusal of monies to federally intergrated schools and denial of transfers on the basis of admission tests other than race.[11] In the August 1955 National Governor's Conference in Chicago, Timmerman proposed the formation of a third party. Such a party might in theory be more amenable to Southern "states' rights" and segregation than would a nationally-based traditional party. In view of the solid failure in 1948 of a similar proposed measure, his plans were not well received[12]

[5]Governor George Bell Timmerman, Jr., Papers, Boxes 38-39, South Carolina State Archives, Columbia, South Carolina.

[6]George Bell Timmerman, "For Governor," prepared, published and distributed by the friends of George Bell Timmerman, Jr., 1955, vertical files, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

[7]George Bell Timmerman, *Southern Affairs*, article in magazine about Governor Timmerman, 7 May 1956, p. 12, vertical files, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

[8]Governor George Bell Timmerman, Jr., Papers, box 38, File "Segregation," South Carolina State Archives, Columbia, South Carolina.

[9]Governor George Bell Timmerman, Jr., Papers, Box 38, File "Segregation," South Carolina State Archives, Columbia, South Carolina.

[10]Governor George Bell Timmerman, Jr., Papers, Box 38, File "Segregation," South Carolina State Archives, Columbia, South Carolina.

[11]Hallie B. Henry, "Governor George Bell Timmerman and the 1956 Southern Solidarity" (M.A. Thesis, University of South Carolina, 1972), 12.

[12]Henry, "Governor George Bell Timmerman," 6.

"Interposition" was another maneuver tried by Timmerman and like-thinking legislators; on January 31, 1956, Senator Marion Gressette submitted to the House of Representatives in South Carolina such a resolution.[13] It was mildly worded, but urged Congress to "condemn the 'illegal encroachment by the central government into the reserve powers of the state.'"[14] In other words, the interposition, signed into effect by Timmerman on February 14, 1956, put "South Carolina's sovereignty between its schools and a United States Supreme Court decision that race segregation in public schools is unconstitutional." By this ruling, Timmerman attempted to preserve the state's right to control its schools and to close schools rather than allow racial mixing.[15]

Timerman had his allies at home in such eventually federally thwarted maneuvers; State Representative Albert W. Watson from Richland County approved his attempts "to protect our state sovereignty."[16] His most important critics were outside the state. His failure to convince fellow governors regarding their party formation in 1956 has been noted. Many southern politicians opposed open party breaks and the championing of marked, obvious attempts, such as interposition, to avoid the Supreme Court's ruling on school segregation.[17] A notable example, Virginia Senator A. William Robertson stated his doubts in a letter to Timmerman that the Supreme Court's ruling could be defied, and expressed his conviction that only by sticking together, in established parties, could the South gain some political concessions.[18] Robertson concluded that he didn't "think it would be very realistic . . . to go to the Chicago [Democratic 1956] Convention . . .in behalf of States Rights and segregated public schools."[19]

In the end, Timmerman, his allies and the state of South Carolina were divided; the National Democratic party was accepted.[20] The governor's frustration must have been great. Timmerman, through his state's rights ventures or, more accurately, by his segregationist ploys, had demonstrated a degree of political naivety and perhaps plain obstinate short-sightedness. Those politicians who disagreed with Timmerman might, in considering the momentum and magnitude of the social changes taking place in the 1950's, be regarded as ". . . [understanding] the game of politics far more acutely than did Timmerman and his cohorts."[21]

As early as 1956, in addition to his stubborn exploration of political, southern-unity methods around federal "interference," Timmerman also made some attempts at blockage, or harassment, of civil rights groups in South Carolina through anti-Communist tactics. At the least he was checking up on them. In March 1956 he requested from John J. Riley in

[13]Henry, "Governor George Bell Timmerman," 30.

[14]Henry, "Governor George Bell Timmerman," 31.

[15]George Bell Timmerman, *The News and Courier*, article by W. D. Workman, Jr., 15 February 1956, p. 1-A, vertical files, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

[16]*Charleston News and Courier*, 14 January 1958, 1-B.

[17]"In a Word, Interposition, The South Grasps A Straw," *Charlotte Observer*, 28 January 1956, in "Governor George Bell Timmerman," Hallie B. Henry, 29.

[18]Letter from a Willis Robertson to Timmerman, dated 13 June 1956, in "Governor George Bell Timmerman," Hallie B. Henry, 68.

[19]Letter from A. Willis Robertson to Timmerman, dated 13 June 1956, in "Governor George Bell Timmerman," Hallie B. Henry, 69.

[20]Henry, "Governor Goerge Bell Timmerman, 115.

[21]Henry, "Governor George Bell Timmerman," 114.

the United States House of Representatives information on persons involved with "officers and directors" of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored Persons; cited in the files he received (citation *not* meaning condemnation but investigation) were Walter P. Reuther, Thurgood Marshall, and Roy Wilkins, secretary for the NAACP.[22]

In March that same year Timmerman, according to the *Cheraw Chronicle*, signed into law a pronouncement on the NAACP, stating that no member could hold public office or retain position in local or county school districts. The *Chronicle* proclaimed its distress and its conviction that such a measure, affecting primarily educated blacks, would not serve unity and would increase bad racial relations.[23] In light of Timmerman's efforts to halt undesired change in his state, this may have been his purpose. A linear pattern in the governor's apparent attitudes evolved, connecting blacks and education with threat of change with subversion. Many of Timmerman's attempts to stop de-segregation had in fact been subverted, but due to normal political/social cycles rather than communist plots.

In the summer of 1957, as a grand prelude to Timmerman's call for creation of a committee to investigate communism in the state, came the Allen-Benedict "scandal." Frank R. Veal, the president of black Allen University in Columbia, South Carolina, requested the resignation of three faculty members, stating that this would be "better for the university and its program."[24] The *Charlotte Observer* of August 6, 1957 noted that two of the three men, professors John G. Rideout and Forrest G. Wiggins, were listed in the files of the United States House Committee on Un-American Activities.[25] The men, according to the *Observer*, refused to quit at the time.

By early January 1958 the Board of Education refused to recognize Allen as an accredited college; this action virtually barred its students from teaching in the state. Bishop I. H. Bonner, Allen University Board Chairman, recommended dismissal of Rideout, Wiggins, and the third man, Edwin Hoffman. Hoffman and Rideout were white, Wiggins black.[26] The connection between certification of the school and retention of "undesirable" faculty is certain. Timmerman brusquely told general secretary Robert K. Carr of the American Association of University Professors, when the latter called to request information on the certification problem at Allen, to "seek the answer to his question from his own files;"[27] he apparently was referring to records concerning alleged subversive activities in which the professors had engaged. Later in January 1958 Timmerman said of the AAUP that it "claims to be an accrediting agency, but has more of the appearance of a political pressure front."[28]

[22]Governor George Bell Timmerman, Papers, Box 59, File "NAACP--House Committee on Un-American Activities," South Carolina State Archives, Columbia, South Carolina.

[23]George Bell Timmerman, "Law Misses Its Mark," *Choctaw Chronicle*, 22 March 1956, vertical files, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

[24]Governor George Bell Timmerman, Papers, Box 59, File "Allen University Dismissals," *Greenville News*, 6 august 1957, South Carolina State Archives, Columbia, South Carolina.

[25]Governor George Bell Timmerman, Papers, Box 59, File "Allen University Dismissals," *Charloue Observer*, 6 August 1957, South Carolina State Archives, Columbia, South Carolina.

[26]*The State* (Columbia), 2 January 1958, 1-A.

[27]*The Charleston News and Courier*, 16 January 1958, 7-A.

[28]*The Charleston News and Courier*, 16 January 1958, 1-B.

Dr. Veal would not comment publicly on the firing; indeed he was bound *not* to talk at a meeting with the University Board and Timmerman. Bonner and Timmerman both said that the state's accreditation decision was not based on race. However, "partisan supporters of the trio of professors . . . have charged that the move is aimed at de-integration of the college faculty by getting rid of the two white professors."[29]

Timmerman, in his address to the General Assembly on January 15, 1958 discussed Allen University, stating that approval for teacher training there would be withdrawn "until such time . . . it is in the public interest to grant approval."[30] He dwelled at some length on the undesirability of the Allen professors, ranging from references to their co-operating with "other Communist Party members and agents [in] getting over party line ideas," to subscribing to Party front journals such as the *National Guardian* and attending meetings of the American People's Congress.[31]

In a General Assembly address on January 29 Timmerman again denounced the Allen professors. This time, Benedict College was included in his remarks; the president of Benedict, J. A. Bacoats, having attended a 1941 meeting in New York sponsored by what the governor described as a communist-promoting publication, the *Protestant Digest*.[32]

Timmerman asserted that the "presence of Communists at these two negro institutions . . . [is part] of a long-range program to promote racial hatred . . . looking toward an ultimate communist goal of creating civil and racial disorder."[33] This theme was not new with the governor; in the January 15 address he had declared "The communist menace . . . a very real menace. . . ."[34] Timmerman's segregationist remarks focused on education. In that same speech he expounded on racial problems and hatreds created by an integrated system. In close proximity to these remarks the governor added that "Responsible colored people are to be commended for their good sense in refusing to follow the false advice of communist agitators and their dupes."[35]

Timmerman's January remarks to the General Assembly, examined in total, indicate a degree of cohesive thinking. Division (segregation) demonstrated a lack of problems; integration--and anyone thought to favor such a policy--was subversive. The link between communism and integration becomes manifest along these lines of thought and the two ideas almost interchangeable. Apparently President Bacoats understood the direction the governor's attacks were leading; in his response in *The (Columbia) State*, after declaring his total lack of involvement with communism, Bacoats said:

[29]"Allen Head Silent on Firing Report," *Charleston News and Courier*, 2 January 1958, 1-B.
[30]South Carolina *Journal of the Senate*, printed by direction of the State Budget Control Board, 15 January 1958, 117.
[31]South Carolina *Journal of the Senate*, 15 January 1958, 119.
[32]*The State* (Columbia), 8 February 1958, 1-B.
[33]South Carolina *Journal of the Senate*, 29 January 1958, 209.
[34]South Carolina *Journal of the Senate*, 15 January 1958, 121.
[35]South Carolina *Journal of the Senate*, 15 January 1958, 110.

> "We sincerely hope that it is not the general policy of the Governor of South Carolina to label as communists . . . citizens of the State who do not accept and agree with the governor's points of view in regard to race and human relations."Bacoats further noted that "democratic and Christian" social changes were coming and that Timmerman could not ward them off forever.[36]

Bacoats also expressed the concern that there were "implications and overtones" in Timmerman's General Assembly remarks suggesting that he wanted to control what was taught in black colleges and the views of teachers in these college.[37] Timmerman had claimed in his January 15 address that, since faculty with Ph.D.s were required by rule of the Southern Association--an organization he berated as being against loyalty oaths or co-operation with investigative committees--and since the pool of high-degree teachers was limited, less wealthy schools had to "make do" with professors left after high-profile schools had had their pick. Timmerman said that this opened the door to "infiltration of undesired and highly trained communist workers."[38] The governor's opinions of the ability and position of the college faculty seemed to be confused with his vision of loyalty and good citizenship.

In this same January speech, Timmerman had "recommend[ed] establishment of a permanent legislative committee to investigate communist activities in our State." This committee was to have power to subpoena and to take testimony under oath. The governor went on to say, "If any person should refuse without good reason to appear and testify, that in itself would provide the public with needed information."[39] In this, Timmerman adopted a "party-line" espoused only a few years earlier in the rhetoric and simplistic reasoning of Senator Joseph McCarthy.

Timmerman added that the formation of such a committee alone would have a good effect; following his familiar argument of tying education--at least in some institutions---to his fears of subversive influences, he said that more "realistic" requirements were desirable for teachers, especially in State-supported institutions, and that their applicants needed to be more thoroughly screened. "When academic freedom supersedes loyalty to one's country, loyalty to one's State, and to our trust in God, it becomes an instrumentality of treason that profanes the faith [of] our nation."[40]

High sounding and possibly well-meant as Timmerman's words were, his reasoning for backing the formation of an investigative committee is open to question. Charges against teachers at Allen and Benedict had been somewhat vague, proven connection to actual, treasonous behavior was lacking, and in neither of the governor's January addresses

[36]*The State* (Columbia), 8 February 1958, 1-B.
[37]*The State* (Columbia), 8 February 1958, 8-B.
[38]South Carolina *Journal of the Senate*, 15 January 1958, 120.
[39]South Carolina *Journal of the Senate*, 15 January 1958, 121.
[40]South Carolina *Journal of the Senate*, 15 January 1958, 121.

did he give supporting evidence that subversion in the state of South Carolina was so widespread a problem as to call for strong corrective measures. No other institutions were denounced as containing positive left-wing elements, except the two black colleges.

In his General Assembly address of January 29, Timmerman again called for a permanent legislative committee to investigate communist activities, and again connected his remarks with his conviction of the need for "more reasonable" teachers' college requirements and stronger prehiring screening in state-funded institutions.[41] His proposal caused much commentary; John H. M. McCray, chairman of the South Carolina Progressive Democrats, a black, denied Timmerman's charges of Communist influence on blacks at Allen and Benedict and requested a bi-racial study committee of any problems, rather than creation of an official probe committee.[42] Major newspaper "Letter to the Editor" sections contained some commentary. In March 1958 Ms. Margaretta P. Childs wrote a letter in the *Charleston News and Courier* against the governor's proposal. She commented that Timmerman was using his office to set up an harassment committee to "get" four or five professors who "like a considerable number of South Carolinians, do not share Governor Timmerman's views on the race question."[43] Here again, a connection was made with Timmerman's push for solid anti-Communist action and his racial standpoint. Not all agreed with Ms. Childs; on a later day in the same newspaper, March 11, Mrs. Francis P. Mims answered Ms. Childs that "Communism feeds on attacks such as yours . . . [the] nation owes a debt of gratitude to the fight congressional committees are making. . . ."[44]

In February 1958 the South Carolina House Ways and Means Committee was empowered to create a committee to investigate communism and also to appropriate monies for said committee.[45] After standard readings in both houses according to legislative procedure, the committee was officially established; the act creating it was ratified April 16, 1958.[46] The official title of the Committee, composed of six members (three from the House, three from the Senate), was the "Committee to Investigate Communist Activitites Within the State." Senator John C. West was the Committee chairman,[47] and was to remain so for the first half dozen years of its existence. Response to establishment of the committee was subdued; one newspaper included only a brief paragraph of information on the formation, put in with notice of a bill requiring regulation of pinball licensing.[48]

Timmerman lost the 1958 election to Ernest Hollings. In his last address to the Joint Assembly, January 14, 1959, Timmerman delivered his final remarks as governor concerning the situation he had fought against for four years in so many ways; "[the] gravest problem facing our State in the last four years has been the attempted but failing effort to force de-

[41]South Carolina *Journal of the Senate*, 29 January 1958, 212.
[42]*Charleston News and Courier*, 21 February 1958, 1-B.
[43]"Letters to the Editor," *Charleston News and Courier*, March 1958.
[44]"Letters to the Editor," *Charleston News and Courier*, 11 March 1958, 8-A.
[45]South Carolina *Journal of the Senate*, 1958, 1243.
[46]South Carolina *Journal of the House*, printer by direction of the State Budget Control Board, 16 April 1958, 1359.
[47]South Carolina *Journal of the Senate*, printed by direction of the State Budget Control Board, 1958, 1586.
[48]*Charleston News and Courier*, 2 April 1958, 1-B.

segregation, and thereby create racial turmoil."[49] Later in the speech he added, "Most of the racial agitators have been effectively silenced."[50] *The News and Courier and Charleston Evening Post* said of Timmerman that not many were "for or against" him in the legislature, and that the outgoing governor employed few manipulations of government, leaving the business of segregation to a committee headed by Senator Gressette. The newspaper delivered a fitting summary of Timmerman and his term of office; "In public utterances, he was an ardent, almost militant, segregationist."[51]

The Committee filed its initial report with the Senate on May 7, 1959. Senator West and the other members made note that George B. Bishop, a former Federal Bureau of Investigations agent, had been employed as a general counsel. Conferences were held with South Carolina Law Enforcement Division personnel, especially with head of the Division J. P. Strom, to discuss ways and means of enforcing the Committee's purpose. To uncover information regarding subversive activity, the Committee decided to use existing law enforcement methods and to establish ties with comparable federal agencies such as the United State Committee on Internal Security and the House of Representatives Committee on Un-American Activities.[52]

Enumerated duties of the Committee included examination and determination whether such left-wing activity existed in South Carolina as to require legal redress, and power to decide if more legislation was needed to fight such operations. The Committee also stated that the services of Stanley F. Morse of Charleston would be used, Morse having some expertise regarding subversive activities. Having set up great forces of assistance, it was noted by the Committee that, while communism was a grave threat to the United States government, no evidence of a great Communist conspiracy in South Carolina had been obtained in 1959.[53]

In its inital report, the Committee did display traces of the racial unrest and social confusion on which it was founded; though it did not name Allen and Benedict openly, the report noted with satisfaction that persons with Communist backgrounds were no longer employed by "certain educational institutions in the State." It also related that:

> ". . . the fact that there is today relatively little racial unrest in South Carolina is in the Committee's opinion indicative of the failure up to this time of the communist doctrine to take widespread root among the colored race in South Carolina."[54]

[49]South Carolina *Journal of the Senate*, printed by direction of the State Budget Control Board, 14 January 1959, 135.
[50]South Carolina *Journal of the Senate*, 14 January 1959, 143.
[51]George Bell Timmerman, *The News and courier and Charleston Evening Post*, 19-20 January 1959, 4-C, fertical files, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.
[52]South Carolina *Journal of the Senate*, 7 May 1959, 1138.
[53]South Carolina *Journal of the Senate*, 7 May 1959, 1139.
[54]South Carolina *Journal of the Senate*, 7 May 1959, 1140.

Forceful and wary as the Committee sounded in its initial report, study of its reports for the next five years indicate that no new legislation was considered necessary to battle communism in South Carolina. By 1961 the Committee's title was altered to the "Committee to Investigate Communist Activities and to Establish an Educational Program on the Threat of Communism."[55] The 1962 report to the Congress revealed no situation which had required a subpoena. The Committee did make a Concurrent Resolution, adopted May 10, 1961, to order the development of a program of education in South Carolina on the Communist threat. At the same time, the annual report stated that it knew programs ". . . could have only a remote effect upon the external forces of communism."[56]

Interestingly, in its statements of educational mission this committee, dedicated to investigating communism, admitted that it would have problems producing an educational program because of 1) limited knowledge of education or communism and 2) fear of a lack of "propriety" in a government agency being involved in what might be called propaganda.[57] According to the Committee report of March 26, 1963, even the educational purpose had been diluted; the Committee declared itself a "catalytic agent," claiming a limited role in education. It proposed basically to assist educators, to "insure that a factual, reasonably full presentation is made in the public schools and to the public generally of the two contrasting systems -- Democracy and Communism."[58] To this end, the Committee's requests for appropriations ($98,000 were requested in 1963) were for planned educational television presentations, teacher training, and equipment on education about communism.[59]

The Committee's authority and rulings were mild in comparison to Tennessee, for example, which made a 1951 death penalty ruling in "cases of unlawful advocacy," or Michigan, which in 1950 set up life imprisonment laws for writing or speaking subversion."[60] That wholesale intimidation tactics were not used was due in large part to the subdued methods of J.P. Strom, head of the State Law Enforcement division. Strom had studied the brutal enforcement and control used in Mississippi committees against subversion, and returned to South Carolina determined to do the exact opposite.[61]

Restricted by its rules to investigating subversives, the Committee ". . . didn't flush out any communists and didn't do much of anything else.[62] The quiet creation of the committee, its low profile and eventual educational basis indicate that the public and legislature in South Carolina were, from the start, not so much enthusiastic about the Committee as they were not opposed to its existence. Such attitudes and reticence would not have been uncommon in an age of red scares and loyalty oaths, still affected by the oppressive maneuvers of the McCarthy years.

[55]South Carolina *Journal of the Senate*, printed under the direction of the State Budget Control Board, 1961, 1835.
[56]South Carolina *Journal of the Senate*, printed under the direction of the State Budget Control Board, 1962, 1141.
[57]South Carolina Congress, Joint Committee to Investigate Communist Activities in South Carolina, annual report, 26 March 1963, 1.
[58]South Carolina Congress, Joint Committee to Investigate Communist Activities in South Carolina, annual report, 26 March 1963, 2.
[59]South Carolina Congress, Joint Committee to Investigate Communist Activities in South Carolina, annual report, 26 March 1963, 6.
[60]Norman Thomas, *The Test of Freedom* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1954), 166.
[61]*The State* (Columbia), 6 October 1991, 9-D.
[62]*The State* (Columbia), 6 October 1991, 9-D.

Governor Timmerman, if he was not consciously aware of the public atmosphere, at least took advantage of the opinions of the day to encourage one last attempt at creating what could be called a social protest, since it was apparently unneeded as a public protection. Many in South Carolina were fervently opposed to integration, clearly the direction in which the nation was heading. The state never went to the violent lengths of Mississippi, but the intent, evident in the establishment of the Committee to Investigate Communist Activities itself, was always to find means of ountering civil rights laws. In conclusion, the Committee's formation and purpose was not nearly so much to rid South Carolina of communism as it was to react against threatened loss of the state's established social order.

MENDEL RIVERS: THE CONGRESSMAN WHO MADE THE C-5A FLY

William Huntley
Governor's School for Science and Mathematics

Three days before he left office, President Dwight D. Eisenhower gave his farewell address to the nation. In his speech he spoke about the dangers of a growing military-industrial complex. He warned:

> This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. In the councils of government we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.[1]

Eight years later Representative L. Mendel Rivers argued that Eisenhower's famous warning had been taken out of context by critics of the military. He reminded people that Eisenhower had also said that the nation needed a strong and ready military.[2] Rivers believed that the military-industrial complex provided for a strong and ready military. Opponents of the military-industrial complex believed that the costs of military hardware were becoming prohibitive and economically endangered America. If there was an observable focal point for the critics of the military-industrial complex during the late 1960s, it was the controversial C-5A. The C-5A became Mendel Rivers' adopted baby and he was its chief defender in the Congress.

[1]"Military Industrial Complex: The Facts vs. the Fictions," *US News and World Report*, April 21, 1969, 61.
[2]Charleston *News and Courier, May 24, 1969, 8-A.*

During the 1950s the military came to see a need for rapid deployment of troops and material due to the country's vital interests in the Middle East and elsewhere. Sea lift and airlift programs in the Navy and Air Force were underfunded by those services because they saw their support of the Army as a secondary mission and tended to ask for items which supported their primary combat role. Due to prodding by Mendel Rivers, who helped establish the Military Airlift Command (MAC), the Air Force purchased new transport planes built by the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation which could deploy troops and material swiftly to where they might be needed urgently. The first plane for this purpose was the turbo-prop C-130 Hercules. The C-130 was a short-range, versatile, and durable cargo plane. The next plane was the C-141 Starlifter, a reliable long-range cargo jet.

In December 1964 Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara announced that President Lyndon Johnson had approved the development of a military cargo plane code named CX. McNamara stated that the CX would be the largest jet plane in the world and would be capable of hauling 600 armed infantrymen (a large battalion) or 250,000 pounds of cargo. It would also transport any piece of a combat division's equipment, such as an M-60 tank. The CX's range at maximum take-off load (750,000 gross pounds) would be over 5,000 miles.[3] When Secretary McNamara made the announcement of the CX project he estimated the development costs of a prototype to be $750 million; three squadrons (58 planes) of the CX would cost over $1 billion.[4]

The CX was intended to be part of McNamara's cost-cutting program. He realized that although the United States had extensive commitments abroad it could not continue to keep and pay for the divisions it kept overseas. His solution was to move sufficient forces quickly to trouble spots when they erupted. The mission of the force sent would be to contain a brushfire situation and then quell it. The CX was to be the primary troop and heavy equipment mover to world trouble spots.[5] In terms of military strategy the CX was to be the linchpin of "Economy of Force."

The CX was the first military project which came under McNamara's "total package procurement" concept. One contractor was to do the entire project from start to finish. The Defense Department announced in September 1965 that Lockheed had won the contract to develop and build 58 of these large jet cargo planes for $2 billion. Secretary McNamara explained that Lockheed's bid to produce the CX was $250 million lower than bids submitted by the Douglas Aircraft Company and the Boeing Company.[6] Later another contract was drawn up for a total of 120 of these planes, now called the C-5A. The price for the additional C-5A's was to be based on Lockheed's actual costs to produce the aircraft.[7]

Before Lockheed signed the initial contract in October 1965 the Pentagon let it be known clearly that the C-5A was to be developed and produced with present "state of the

[3]*Facts on File Yearbook: 1964*, Lester Sobel, ed., (New York: Facts on File, Inc., 1965), 466.
[4]Ibid.
[5]Henry Trewhitt, *McNamara*, (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1971), 158.
[6]*Facts on File Yearbook: 1965*, 375.
[7]Trewhitt, 158.

art" technology and no "new science" or technology was to be devised to manufacture it.[8] The contract stipulated that the Air Force could cancel its order if the plane did not meet agreed standards.[9] By mid-1968 it had become clear that Lockheed's cost estimates to manufacture the C-5A were too low and that the plane did not meet the set standards.

In November 1968 Senator William Proxmire (D-Wisconsin) chaired a senate subcommittee which looked into the problems of the C-5A. His committee began to make disturbing discoveries, and it criticized policies and procedures used by officials at Lockheed, the Air Force, and the Pentagon. The committee called high-ranking officials from the Government Accounting Office (GAO) to testify.

These officials said that the GAO could not complete its investigation of C-5A cost overruns because the Air Force and Lockheed refused to give their office the necessary information.[10] Proxmire and other senators asked Air Force officers, who became increasingly defensive, why production of the C-5A was not suspended as was stipulated, since the plane did not meet the required standards.[11] Proxmire's subcommittee also released evidence that the Air Force intended to (and later did) fire A. Ernest Fitzgerald. Fitzgerald was an Air Force efficiency expert and the man responsible for bringing Lockheed's cost overruns and substandard production to light.[12]

Shortly before the problems with the C-5A surfaced Charleston's Air Force base was chosen to receive the first squadron of C-5As. A year later Mendel Rivers came to dedicate a new building at the Avco Lycoming complex in the city which manufactured turbine engines and spare parts for Army utility and attack helicopters. After the dedication local reporters asked him about the alleged $2 billion cost overrun of the C-5A program. Rivers replied that he and the House Armed Services Committee (HASC) had been investigating the problem and the figure was nothing close to $2 billion. He remarked that the cost overrun could be traced back to McNamara who had initiated "cradle to grave" contracts.[13]

Rivers became increasingly irritated at the critics and the criticism surrounding the C-5A. Representative William Moorhead (D-Pennsylvania) sent a public letter to Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird concerning the C-5A's "shocking" cost overruns and later appeared on network television where he declared that changes needed to be made in military procurement.[14] After Moorhead's television appearance Rivers wrote him a letter which challenged him to testify before the HASC to defend his statements about military procurement. Rivers letter said in part:

[8]"C-5A, Go Away," *The New Republic*, December 25, 1971, 9.
[9]Ibid.
[10]*News and Courier*, January 17, 1969, 2-A.
[11]Ibid.
[12]Ibid.
[13]*News and Courier*, May 13, 1969, 1-A.
[14]*News and Courier*, May 17, 1969, 6-A.

> I gained the impression from your comments that you feel members of the Congress who historically have dealt with military procurement have in substance become the hand-maidens of the Department of Defense and defense contractors. I am sure you realize that this is a very serious charge . . . personally directed at me and at each member of the committee . . . [and I invite] you to present whatever evidence you may have to substantiate your allegations.[15]

Moorhead agreed to appear before the HASC, but only if it was a public hearing and not the usual closed-door session.[16] Rivers did not consent to this. Their dispute was resolved when Moorhead sent Rivers a letter which stated it had not been his intention to condemn Rivers or any member of the HASC when it came to military procurement.[17]

As the dispute with Moorhead ended, another one took its place. Rivers received a letter from a HASC member, Charles Whalen (R-Ohio), who requested that Lockheed officials attend a HASC hearing on the C-5A where Air Force officers were to testify. Whalen wanted both parties present to clear up conflicting statements which had been made by Air Force officers and Lockheed officials.[18] Rivers was angry that Whalen made the letter public before he had a chance to see it and speak to him about the request. He chastised Whalen for making the request at such a late date, as Whalen knew it would be impossible to force Lockheed officials to attend on such short notice.[19] Rivers said he would "invite Lockheed to testify at the proper time" and that his committee would not be rushed into anything. He stated it was going to take time as the C-5A cost overruns were a complicated issue and when the HASC finally sorted it out the public would get all the facts.[20]

At the hearing the Air Force's comptroller, Lieutenant General Durward Crow, testified that the type of contract used to purchase the C-5A would not be used in the future because the "mechanics" of it were "difficult to administer." Crow also testified that the cost of purchasing 120 C-5As had grown to $4.35 billion, nearly one billion over the contracted price.[21] However, the man responsible for writing the contract, former Assistant Air Force Secretary Robert Charles, told Rivers and the committee that while C-5A cost more than expected, it would have been hundreds of millions more with the type of contract used in the 1950s.[22] Charles claimed that his C-5A contract was "the toughest contract for a major weapons system ever signed by the Pentagon."[23]

[15]Ibid.
[16]Ibid.
[17]*Charleston Evening Post*, May 22, 1969, 8-D.
[18]*News and Courier*, May 22, 1969, 1-A.
[19]Ibid.
[20]Ibid.
[21]*News and Courier*, May 23, 1969, 4-C.
[22]*News and Courier*, June 17, 1969, 6-A.
[23]*Facts on File Yearbook: 1969*, 375.

In January 1970, Senator John Stennis (D-Mississippi), chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, ordered new hearings on the C-5A which had nothing to do with cost overruns. These hearings concerned the safety of the aircraft itself. The Air Force discovered a large crack in the wing of one of the ten operational C-5As it had received from Lockheed and grounded all ten planes for thorough inspections. Rivers, who had received the same reports on the cracked wing as had Stennis, also planned to hold hearings. He argued that minor problems were to be expected, as the C-5A was the largest plane ever attempted to be built. Rivers confidently predicted that the C-5A was "going to work. . . . We [have] put a lot of money into that plane."[24] (After extensive testing the wings were reinforced with a brace. The Air Force later had problems with the plane's low-level radar, landing gear, automatic pilot, and engine de-icing which Lockheed also fixed.)[25]

Senator Proxmire did not share Mendel Rivers' confidence even after the Air Force cleared eight of the ten planes for operational flight status. Speaking from the floor of the Senate he told his colleagues that the C-5A was "unsafe at any load [and] the decision by the Air Force to accept and fly defective C-5As is deplorable and scandalous."[26] Rivers was apoplectic and called Proxmire a "damn liar."[27] Charleston's congressman asserted that if such criticism did not stop Lockheed would go bankrupt. He declared:

> If somebody does not come to the aid of the great Lockheed Company, Georgia may see it close its doors. I don't care how great it is, no corporation can take it forever by people who are fighting the military by the back door.[28]

The Lowcountry lawmaker swung into action and led the counter-attack for Lockheed and its C-5A. He knew how the Congress (particularly the House) operated. Rivers controlled and directed things so thoroughly as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee that he boldly proclaimed in October 1969 that his legislative successes as chairman topped anything done by "Julius Caesar in all his glory."[29] After his solitary effort got a defense spending bill out of a joint armed services conference committee with expenditures which greatly exceeded what the Senate wanted (and later met Secretary of Defense Laird's and President Nixon's approval), Senator William Fulbright (D-Arkansas) caustically commented, "Of course no one can turn down Julius Caesar. Even our Secretary of Defense could not resist Julius Caesar."[30]

[24]*News and Courier*, January 20, 1970, 3-B.
[25]*News and Courier*, February 22, 1970, 11-B.
[26]*Charleston Evening Post*, January 30, 1970, 1-A.
[27]Ibid.
[28]Ibid.
[29]*Charleston Evening Post*, October 31, 1969, 1-A.
[30]Marshall Frady, "The Charleston Cold-Warrior from Hell-Hole Swamp," *Southerners: A Journalist's Odyssey*, (New York: The New American Library, Inc., 1980), 78.

Robert Sherrill wrote an article titled "King of the Military Mountain" which was about Rivers and his influence over things of a military nature. Sherrill had this to say:

> When it comes to swinging the Pentagon or tilting the federal budget, [Mendel Rivers] exerts an almost irresistible leverage. Depending on how the books are kept, one-half to three-fourths of the total federal budget, which is the military portion, is largely his creation. Some might suppose that Rivers' counterpart in the Senate, John Stennis, is as powerful. [He is not] . . . Rivers is the most powerful.[31]

Nearly every member of the House and some in the Senate owed Mendel Rivers favors and he began calling in his IOUs. He used them to get the C-5A to fly. River's long-time campaign manager and confidant, Joseph Riley, Sr., a few years after the congressman's death stated that so many people were in political debt to Rivers that "his back bled from being scratched so much."[32] He told House colleagues that if Lockheed folded, thousands of people would lose their jobs, which would ultimately prove to be a tremendous cost to the government.[33]12 He realized that Lockheed needed a little more time and money to correct the C-5A's remaining deficiencies and warned that if the government stopped the production of this "fantastic airplane" it would be like "cutting off our nose to spite our face."[34] Some of the congressmen who may have voted to eliminate the C-5A had military bases located in their districts and they knew what could possibly happen to those bases if they opposed the HASC chairman on this issue.[35] Rivers'arguments and clout made political sense and he personally salvaged the C-5A program and Lockheed. However, the government purchased only 81 (of the 120 ordered) C-5As from Lockheed to keep down its expenses and because of the controversy which surrounded the plane.

On June 6, 1970 Mendel Rivers was at Charleston Air Force Base to greet the arrival of the country's first squadron of C-5As. As part of the show one of the C-5As took off so the thousands in attendance could observe its awesome power and lift capability. They also witnessed something else. When the plane descended to land one of its wheels dropped off and rolled down the runway. Another wheel had its tire blow out after it hit the ground. The congressman was asked by a reporter if he had observed what had just occurred. A seemingly unperturbed Mendel Rivers replied, "Why do you suppose they put 28 wheels on this airplane?"[36] Inside he was seething. He harshly whispered to his good friend Sheriff

[31]Robert Sherrill, "King of the Military Mountain," *The Nation*, January 19, 1970, 40.

[32]Interview conducted by Professor Walter J. Fraser with Joseph Riley, former campaign manager for L. Mendel Rivers, Charleston, SC, March 15, 1973.

[33]Charles McCarry, "Ol' Man Rivers," *Esquire*, October 1970, 171.

[34]*Facts on File Yearbook: 1969*, 375.

[35]*Charleston Evening Post*, March 8, 1968, 1-A.

[36]"Mendel Rivers, *Newsweek*, January 11, 1971, 18.

Ed McTeer that "someone is going to catch hell for this."[37] It was a supreme embarrassment for Rivers as he had ardently endorsed the merits and capabilities of the C-5A.

The C-5A, after a horrendous beginning, proved to be a solid performer in its intended role. Former Staff Sergeant Jeffrey DeMille, an avionics and electronics expert on the C-5A, noted that the plane's basic problem "was the fact it could carry so much weight."[38] The initial wing design was not adequate for the loads the C-5A could carry and its wing spars began to crack. When Lockheed became aware of the problem it improved the wing spars. Lockheed also invented and put in the Active Lift Distribution System (ALDS). Sensors were put in the C-5A's wings and when they sensed the wings flapping they would send a signal equal and opposite to the ailerons which would cancel out the flapping movement. This eased the stress on the redesigned wing spars.[39] The entire wing modification cost $1.6 billion.[40]

The C-5A was nicknamed "the Savior" by Air Force pilots because the first words they uttered after they saw the gigantic craft were "Jesus Christ."[41] Once the pilots became accustomed to the plane they liked flying it although the landings were tricky. Pilots had to alter the regular landing approach and canted the plane over so one set of side wheels in the rear hit first in order to be able to tell when the C-5A touched down. With the standard landing procedure it was nearly impossible to tell if the plane had landed.[42]

The C-5A's huge cost overruns were primarily due to two factors--inflation and changes initiated by the government while the plane was being developed. From the time Lockheed first won the contract in 1965 to its delivery of "bug free" planes in 1970, inflation had increased by over 25 percent and this drove up production costs for Lockheed. The size of the plane also was increased in mid-development, adding to the expense.[43] However, these cost overruns were less in relative terms than what the government had experienced on past major military projects.[44] More significant was that by all accounts the C-5A exceeded every one of the Air Force's performance requirements.[45] In 1973 C-5As proved their worth as they swiftly re-supplied Israel with critical equipment during the Yom Kippur War.[46]

Rivers supported the C-5A because he always had been of the mind that the men and women who defended the United States deserved the very best in vital equipment, not what just could do the job. He believed that the country needed this type of plane because it was

[37]Interview conducted by Professor Walter J. Fraser with Ed McTeer, former sheriff of Beaufort County and Rivers' confidant, Beaufort, South Carolina, December 21, 1972.

[38]Interview with Jeffrey DeMille, former Air Force Staff Sergeant who was an avionics and electronics expert on the C-5A, Charleston, South Carolina, December 31, 1991.

[39]Ibid.

[40]Richard Stubbing, *The Defense Game*, (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1986), 35.

[41]McCarry, 171.

[42]DeMille, *op. cit.*

[43]Ibid.

[44]Ibid.

[45]Ibid.

[46]Stubbing, 321.

stupid to have a "million dollar army" and a "two cent" transportation craft which would render the "million dollar army" worthless. The C-5A fit the transportation requirements of the Army and enhanced its value. When it came to the security of the United States, Rivers did not hold to the "cost effectiveness" arguments of Secretary McNamara, Senator Proxmire, and the civilian Pentagon pundits McNamara had hired.[47]

To him, these people "knew the price of everything and the value of nothing."[48] In a major speech he gave from the House floor he declared that "the factors of military effectiveness in the protection of our Nation's security must always be dominant over the factors of cost."[49]

Mendel Rivers was concerned, though, that a handful of defense companies were coming to win most of the contracts let by the Pentagon. He was aware that the government paid defense contractors far more for their hardware than what it was worth and this included the C-5A. He also knew that the problem was getting worse.[50]Although Rivers did not state this in public, he certainly did in private. The lawmaker possessed a scathing, sarcastic tongue which he did not bite. In closed door HASC hearings he severely questioned generals and admirals and made sure they had their figures correct, especially their cost figures. If they did not, he put their feet to his searing verbal fire. He did what he could to make sure that defense companies gave the military--and the taxpayer--the most for their dollar.[51]

Although Rivers defended the military-industrial complex from what he thought were unfair attacks, he sided with those in the House who wanted to re-establish and strengthen the Renegotiation Board. (The Renegotiation's Board's job was to inspect defense contracts for evidence of profiteering.) He had this to say to fellow House members as he urged them to re-authorize it:

> Both . . . prime contractors and subcontractors are big men; they do not deal in chicken feed. They hire the smartest people on earth to come down here to Washington to sit across the table from some little colonel . . . or somebody else who may not know exactly everything about a computer, and these people can steal you blind, if they want to. That is a fact of life.[52]

It is unfortunate that Mendel Rivers, who was one of the first to recognize the need for heavy airlift capability to enable American forces to be responsive, is mainly

[47]Interview with John R. ("Russ") Blandford, former Chief Counsel to the House Armed Services Committee, Seabrook Island, South Carolina, November 17, 1985.
[48]*US News and World Report*, June 27, 1966, 15.
[49]*News and Courier, May 20, 1966, 5-A.*
[50]McTeer, *op. cit.*
[51]Ibid.
[52]Sherrill, 46.

remembered for the gestation failures of the C-5A and not for being the legislative father of the Military Airlift Command, the C-130, and the C-141 which made him the recipient of the United States Air Force Association's coveted "Bronze Eagle Award" in 1967. (Previous award winners were Igor Sikorsky, the father of the modern helicopter, and General Curtis LeMay, the creator of Strategic Air Command.)[53] After Rivers adopted the C-5A, which had been sired by McNamara, he publicly excused the C-5A's initial defects and this is why he is remembered for the plane's failures.

On the positive side of the ledger, military airlift as envisioned by Rivers has proved to be viable as well as highly effective. During "Operation Desert Storm" when a critical Iraqi bunker or some other emplacement proved to be particularly hardened against standard Air Force bombs and had to be destroyed for later success on the ground, Air Force officers in Saudi Arabia contacted the Pentagon with specifics. The Pentagon then called munitions makers to custom-build a bomb for the selected target. The tailor-made bomb was rushed to Charleston Air Force base . . . where . . . C-141 transports were waiting to make special deliveries. Only 36 hours after the bomb was requested it was being loaded on a warplane in the [Persian] gulf. The Air Force called it "The Desert Express."[54] Charleston's congressman would have been pleased with this example and performance of military airlift capability.

[53]*News and Courier*, February 22, 1967, 10-A.
[54]"The Secret History of the War," *Newsweek*, March 18, 1991, 32.

"LONG LIVE THE QUEEN!" BRIGHT LEAF BEGINS HER REIGN

Eldred E. Prince, Jr.
USC Coastal Carolina College, Conway

Three times in the history of South Carolina tobacco has risen to the status of a money crop.[1] The state's three tobacco periods are separated by time and place and have no apparent historical linkage. South Carolina's fickle relationship with tobacco began in the Lowcountry about 1672 and lasted twenty years. A second tobacco boom took place in the Upcountry from the 1760s until about 1805. The crop made its third appearance in the Pee Dee region when farmers there began experimenting with Bright Leaf in the 1880s. Although the primary focus of this essay is the third period, some understanding of the first and second is desirable.

In the colony's infancy, English settlers planted tobacco around Charleston.[2] The leaf was said to be excellent, and it earned a good reputation in Europe. But in the 1680s Virginia and Maryland growers produced such an abundance that the price collapsed and tobacco became unprofitable.[3] Given the uncertain tobacco situation, Lowcountry farmers began dedicating their energies and acreage to more promising crops. One of these was rice. European demand made a lively market for rice. Moreover, since the cereal grew only in tidewater areas, the threat of over-production was far smaller and its profitability far greater than tobacco. In the 1680s and 90s rice became the staple crop of the Lowcountry, and tobacco farming disappeared in South Carolina.[4]

[1]The author gratefully acknowledges the valuable advice and suggestions of Mary Parramore of the South Carolina Department of Archives and History and Robert R. Simpson of Coker College.

[2]See Maurice Williams to Lord Ashley, 30 August 1671, in Langdon Cheves, ed., "The Shaftesbury Papers and Other Records Relating to Carolina and the First Settlement on the Ashley River Prior to the Year 1676" published in *Collections of the South Carolina Historical Society*, vol. 5 (Richmond: William E. Jones, 1897) 297,376.

[3]On the quality of South Carolina tobacco see Alexander Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina, 1650-1708* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911) 147, 175; on the tobacco depression of the 1680s see Lewis C. Gray, *A History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860*, vol. 2 (Carnegie Institute, 1932; Peter Smith Reprint, 1958) 265-266.

[4]A classic source on rice is Alexander Salley, *The Introduction of Rice Culture into South Carolina*, Historical Commission of South Carolina Bulletin No. 6, (Columbia: 1919); more recent summaries are Robert Weir, *Colonial South Carolina: A History* (Millwood: KTO Press, 1983) 145 and Charles W. Joyner, *Down by the Riverside: A South Carolina Slave Community* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984) 13-14.

About sixty years later, farmers in the South Carolina Upcountry reestablished tobacco as a cash crop. Many Piedmont settlers hailed from leaf-producing regions of Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania, and the newcomers brought tobacco seed and experience with them into the South Carolina Upcountry. In the 1760s rising leaf prices revived interest in the crop. Too far from the coast to grow rice, immigrants from the Middle Colonies transplanted tobacco culture to the soil of their new homeland. During the next thirty years, the tobacco trade flourished. Leaf exports were interrupted by the War for Independence, but resumed with great vigor after hostilities ended. By 1799 South Carolina farmers were exporting ten million pounds of tobacco per year.[5]

By 1800 technological advances in Britain and the United States combined to propel cotton into the spotlight of the Industrial Revolution. Whitney's famous gin joined the spinning and weaving machines of Hargreaves and Crompton in making good, cheap, cotton cloth, and the world could not get enough of it. Cotton soon superseded rice as the state's leading export. The new staple could grow almost anywhere and flourished in Piedmont soils. Moreover, cotton could be cultivated in small plots and required smaller capital outlays unlike the expensive hydraulic system needed for rice culture. Thus small farmers could profit from the cotton boom as they never could with rice.

As demand for cotton pushed its price and profitability far beyond tobacco's, farmers abandoned leaf for lint, and the red hills of the Upcountry were soon literally white unto the harvest. In the face of the great cotton boom, tobacco's decline was swift and total. After about 1805 tobacco became almost extinct in South Carolina. From a peak of ten million pounds, annual production in the Palmetto State fell to about 50,000 pounds, a decline exceeding 99 percent.[6]

Throughout much of the nineteenth century, South Carolina deepened its commitment to cotton and slavery. The Civil War ended slavery, however, and the depression of the 1870s almost finished cotton. For one thing, the focus of the Industrial Revolution was shifting away from textiles. For another, the American South faced competition on the supply side as Egypt, India, and Brazil became large cotton producers. Economist Gavin Wright has calculated that the world supply of cotton grew twice as fast as demand, with a predictable effect on prices.[7] As cotton values sank below the cost of production, farmers in the Pee Dee region were looking for a way out of the cotton dilemma. Relief came unexpectedly.

In the late nineteenth century, a cluster of interlocking developments in crop science, technology, and politics combined to revolutionize the tobacco industry. In the 1850s and 1860s tobacco growers in the North Carolina-Virginia 'Old Belt" developed a new variety

[5]Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1970: part 2*, 1197; also Charles W. Gayle, "The Nature and Volume of Exports from Charleston, 1724-1774," *Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Society*, 1937, 33.

[6]Alfred G. Smith, *The Economic Readjustment of an Old Cotton State: South Carolina 1820-1861* (Columbia: USC Press, 1958) 147; David Ramsay, *History of South Carolina from its First Settlement in 1670 to the Year 1809* (Charleston: Walter and Evans, 1809; reprint, Newberry: W.J. Duffie, 1858) 120. On transition to cotton, see Joyce E. Chapter, "Creating a Cotton South in Georgia and South Carolina, 1760-1815," *Journal of Southern History* 57, 2 (May 1991) 174-89; also Gray, *Agriculture*, vol. 2, 684-85.

[7]Gavin Wright, "Cotton Competition and the Recovery of the Post-bellum South," *Journal of Economic History* 34 (September 1974) 610-35; also Gavin Wright, *Old South, New South: Revolutions in the Southern Economy Since the Civil War* (New York: Basic Books, 1986).

of tobacco called Bright Leaf. This mild, aromatic tobacco was ideal for cigarettes, which were then almost unknown in the United States.[8] Nearly a century after the Industrial Revolution turned the American South into a cotton kingdom, technology came calling in the tobacco country. The Eli Whitney of the tobacco industry was James Albert Bonsack of Roanoke, Virginia. In 1882 Bonsack invented a rolling and cutting machine that reduced the cost of manufacturing cigarettes by two-thirds. The following year, Congress, embarrassed by a large revenue surplus, reduced the tax rate on cigarettes by 75 percent. With lower manufacturing costs and taxes, tobacco companies cut the retail price of cigarettes in half and began aggressive advertising. Public response to half-price cigarettes confirmed the wisdom of this marketing strategy. Cigarette consumption in the United States doubled in two years and doubled again in another two, passing two billion units per year in 1887. Of course, the addictive character of cigarette smoking doubtless played a role in its increased popularity as well.[9]

Surging demand for Bright Leaf tobacco offered a sharp contrast to the sluggish cotton market. In the Pee Dee region of South Carolina, progressive-minded farmers began casting a wistful eye at the profit potential offered by tobacco. In the 1880s and 90s Pee Dee farmers responded to the push of low cotton prices and the pull of rising demand for Bright Leaf by embracing tobacco as their salvation.

The third period of tobacco culture in South Carolina emerged in the Pee Dee region eighty years and two hundred miles from where it had been cultivated last. Although no single individual is solely responsible for introducing Bright Leaf culture into South Carolina, there is one who merits first mention. In the early 1880s Frank Mandeville Rogers (1857-1945), a young Darlington County planter, took a long look at Bright Leaf as a possible alternative to cotton. Rogers corresponded with tobacco producers in the "Old Belt" of North Carolina and Virginia about the possibility of introducing the crop to the Pee Dee region. Their response was not encouraging. Old Belt growers may have sincerely doubted the Pee Dee's potential for tobacco culture, but faced with the prospect of new areas going into leaf production, their lack of encouragement may have had other motives. Nevertheless, Rogers . . . differed from their opinion, being satisfied that we had both the soil and climate to grow tobacco successfully and profitably. To test his theory, Rogers planted a small plot in 1884 . . . mainly for the purpose of watching and studying its development. It grew to fine size and mellowed on the hill satisfactorily.[10]

Encouraged by these results, Rogers increased his tobacco plantings in 1885 to three acres, cured the leaves in a log barn he built himself, and shipped them to an Old Belt market. The $600 Rogers received for his three-acre crop removed any doubt that Bright Leaf production was not only possible in the Pee Dee but offered great promise to the farmers of the region.[11] The revolutionary potential of tobacco for Pee Dee farmers is best understood in comparison with cotton. With an average yield of 400 pounds per acre at 8

[8]Nannie May Tilley, *The Bright Tobacco Industry, 1860-1929* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1948) 24-88.
[9]*Historical Statistics*, 690-91; Tilley, *Bright Tobacco*, 557, 570-75.
[10]Charleston *News and Courier*, 3 August 1958. The article quotes Rogers's journal which has since disappeared.
[11]South Carolina Department of Agriculture, *Tobacco Report*, 1938 (Columbia: State Printers, 1939) 2.

cents per pound, a Pee Dee farmer of 1885 could expect to gross about $32 from an acre of cotton. Returns from tobacco were dramatically better. Even after expenses Rogers realized a net profit of $116 per acre on his tobacco, about four times what cotton would pay without allowing for expenses. The commanding advantage of leaf over lint was not lost on Rogers and his neighbors.[12]

Encouraged by his success, Rogers sharply increased his tobacco plantings in 1886 from three acres to twenty. Recognizing the need for experienced guidance in this undertaking, Rogers hired Eugene Currin of Henderson, North Carolina upon recommendation of business acquaintances in the Old Belt. Currin was the first of many North Carolinians and Virginians to enter the Pee Dee and teach Bright Leaf culture to the new neighbors. He later remarked that until he arrived all Pee Dee farmers knew about tobacco was "how to chew it and spit it out."[13]

During the 1887 crop season Rogers and Currin developed an improvement in the harvesting and curing process that had great significance for Bright Leaf growers. It was then common practice to harvest and cure the entire plant. Tobacco leaves ripen in sequence, however, beginning with the bottom leaves and proceeding up the stalk to the "tips." Harvesting and curing the whole plant ensured that bottom leaves were overripe while the tips were not fully mature. Rogers suspected that if leaves were removed as they ripened, a few at a time from the living stalk, and cured immediately, quality would improve. Curing time and fuel would be reduced as well. Using classic scientific method, Rogers divided his thirty-acre crop in half, harvesting and curing the control half in the traditional way. With the other half, however, he proceeded to harvest and cure the leaves as they ripened, with the result that the leaves cured separately from the stalk sold for twice as much as those cured on the stalk.[14]

That tobacco growers in the Old Belt were coming to similar conclusions about leaf harvesting about this time does not diminish Rogers's contribution. It is remarkable that a novice had equally valid and timely perceptions as veteran tobacco growers, let alone the means and confidence to undertake the experiment on such a scale. The South Carolina press publicized Rogers's success with Bright Leaf tobacco. Front page stories in the *Darlington News* kept readers informed of Rogers's progress and profits. Throughout the 1880s and 90s the Charleston *News and Courier* published articles recommending tobacco as an alternative to cotton. The articles made a strong case for Bright Leaf, stressing the suitability of South Carolina soils and climate and citing the success of Rogers and others. Detailed analyses of cultivation techniques, production costs, and projected profits sought to convince readers to abandon cotton for tobacco. *News and Courier* editor Francis Lawson

[12]Cotton data from *Historical Statistics*, vol. 1, 208; tobacco data from an article Rogers contributed to *The News and Courier*, 2 October 1891.

[13]Louise Jones DuBose, "Rewards of the Golden Weed," *South Carolina Magazine* (August 1947) 4; also *Florence Morning News* 4 September 1947; also SCDA *Bulletin*, 1938, 15.

[14]Rogers's journal quoted in Charleston *News and Courier* 3 August 1958.

even obtained a supply of tobacco seed thought to be suitable for South Carolina soils and distributed it free to anyone who applied.[15]

Other South Carolina newspapers were taking an interest in the tobacco movement. The press knew well the consequences of the state's thralldom to the old monarch, and had long exhorted farmers to "throw off the yoke of King Cotton."[16] The urgency of their appeals escalated as cotton prices sank to unprecedented levels. A Columbia journalist lamented South Carolina's stubborn loyalty to cotton in the face of tobacco's greater promise:

> If the farmer will cease to ask "will the price of cotton be higher next year? and will intelligently determine if he can produce more in tobacco than in cotton, he will be nearer the solution of his difficulties .[17]

Although the Charleston and Columbia newspapers often had differences of opinion, they were in perfect accord about tobacco. *The State* featured front page stories promoting the new crop and invited Frank Mandeville Rogers to contribute an article explaining Bright Leaf production from beginning to end.[18] *The State* vowed to continue the tobacco crusade "until that great crop shall be elected to the control of this now cotton-besotted region." The newspaper's efforts did not fall on stony ground, and *The State* continued to recount the successes of South Carolina "tobacco pioneers."[19]

The *Marion Star*, like many weekly papers in courthouse towns, devoted considerable space to agriculture. In 1890 the *Star* began featuring information on tobacco. That same year, Bright Leaf was first grown in Marion County. Doctor C. T. Ford, a local physician, raised a small patch behind his home in Mullins. Though consisting of only a few dozen plants, it was enough to prove that the crop would thrive in Marion County soils.[20] The physician's experiment was followed two years later by Marion County's first commercial Bright Leaf crop. W. H. "Buck" Daniel, a native of Durham, North Carolina, moved to Mullins in the 1870s and established W. H. Daniel Supply Company to serve farmers in the region. He bought land in the community and planted eight acres of tobacco in 1893. Daniel sold his leaf in Danville, Virginia, and his profits made a dramatic impression on his customers and the community at large.[21]

[15]Charleston *News and Courier*, 26 October 1885 and 2 October 1891. The seed was a Cuban variety that did not flourish in South Carolina.

[16]Mary Parramore, "Preservation Plan for Historic Tobacco Related Resources," State Historic Preservation Office, South Carolina Department of Archives and History; *The State*, 9 February 1892.

[17]Ibid,. 27 January 1892.

[18]*The State*, 29 March 1892 and 31 January 1895.

[19]Parramore, "Preservation Plan," also The State, 5 September 1892, and 9 February 1892.

[20]E.D. Lewis, "History of the Mullins Tobacco market," in Frank G. Mason, ed., *The City of Opportunity: Centennial Commemorative Book About Mullins, 1872-1972*, (Mullins Centennial Commission, 1972).

[21]*Mullins Enterprise*, Fortieth Anniversary Edition, 1937.

In the 1890s Bright Leaf truly became a rising star in the economic constellation of South Carolina. The cumulative efforts of tobacco boosters and the nearly hopeless cotton situation began to tell, and the trickle became a torrent. By 1899 the state's tobacco acreage had soared from a mere 400 acres to 26,000 and production had increased a hundred-fold from 200,000 pounds per year to twenty million.[22] While farmers in every part of South Carolina were producing Bright Leaf, the geographical focus of tobacco culture clearly justified *The State* christening the crop "the pearl of the Pee Dee." By 1899 the Pee Dee accounted for 93 percent of the state's tobacco production.[23]

As late as 1890 South Carolina still had no tobacco sales facilities and Pee Dee farmers had to ship their leaf by rail to Old Belt markets. For example, the Holliday Company of Galivants Ferry sold its tobacco to C. D. Noell and Company and Lee's Warehouse in Danville, Virginia.[24] Aware of the need for a local tobacco market and the potential profits for investors, local entrepreneurs began establishing markets in the region. Tobacco pioneer Frank Mandeville Rogers again played a central role in fastening Bright Leaf to the Pee Dee. In 1890 Rogers visited the Old Belt to study marketing methods. While in Durham, he met with James B. Duke of the American Tobacco Company to arrange for buyers to be sent to South Carolina.[25] When he returned, Rogers persuaded other Florence area leaf growers and businessmen to join him in launching Florence Tobacco Manufacturing and Warehouse Company. The first auction sale of Bright Leaf tobacco in South Carolina took place in the new warehouse on 1 October 1891. The *News and Courier* acclaimed the sale as a major economic event with a four-column front-page story titled "A Break for Liberty." Three hundred people attended the sale, including several politicians and the judge, jury, lawyers, and litigants of the Florence County Court which had recessed to watch the sale. Tobacco industry leadership was well represented. Editor Henry Harmon of the *Southern Tobacco Journal*, William E. Dibrell of the Danville firm of Dibrell Brothers, and William Fallon of American Tobacco Company's New York office made the trip to Florence. About five hundred piles of leaf sold for 9 to 26 cents per pound.[26]

Soon entrepreneurs were establishing warehouses in other Pee Dee towns. The Darlington Tobacco Company opened in time for the 1892 season. In 1895 a second warehouse opened in Darlington, and the market there was receiving tobacco from growers in Clarendon, Darlington, Florence, Sumter and Williamsburg Counties.[27] Buck Daniel established Mullins's first tobacco sales facility, the Planters' Warehouse, in 1895.[28] *The News and Courier* reported that merchants and farmers there were "in high spirits" after the first tobacco sale. Some Mullins merchants happily reported being "paid up in full by men

[22]Bureau of the Census, *Report on the Statistics of Agriculture, Eleventh Census, 1890* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1895) 449.

[23]*The State*, 30 August 1895.

[24]Joseph Holliday, "Early Tobacco Planting," *Independent Republic Quarterly*, (Tricentennial Edition, 1970) 20.

[25]*Florence Morning News*, 23 July 1969; SCDA, *Tobacco Report, 1938*, 2.

[26]*News and Courier*, 2 October 1891; also *The State*, 2 October 1891.

[27]*The State*, 23 August 1895.

[28]*The Mullins Enterprise*, Fortieth Anniversary Edition, 1937.

whom they had been carrying over from year to year."[29] Establishment of new warehouses matched increasing tobacco production in the Pee Dee during the century's last decade.

Expanding leaf culture in Marion County convinced a group of Mullins investors to build another warehouse there in 1897. By 1899 the Holliday Company was no longer shipping tobacco to Danville but selling it at Peoples Warehouse in Marion. Many Horry County farmers sold their first crop at Spivey's Warehouse which opened in Conway in 1899. The Conway firm engaged John Coles, an experienced tobacconist from Winston, North Carolina, as general manager. Conway tobacco interests were eager to inform the countryside of this important event. The first trainload of Bright Leaf leaving town featured along the side of each boxcar a sign proclaiming Conway's new status as a tobacco market.[30]

Clemson College, South Carolina's agricultural think tank, contributed enthusiastic support to the tobacco movement. Aware of the state's chronic affliction with cotton, Clemson faculty and students joined their pens and voices with those urging diversification. Faculty members contributed articles to the popular press and submitted student monographs to the Commissioner of Agriculture for publication and distribution throughout South Carolina. In 1912 Clemson established the Pee Dee Experiment Station near Florence to conduct research and advance tobacco crop science. The college hired Eugene Currin, the North Carolinian who joined Frank Mandeville Rogers in his tobacco venture, to manage the Pee Dee station.[31]

Bright Leaf continued to gain ground in the Pee Dee after the turn of the century. The years 1905-1915 saw lands in leaf production multiply five-fold from 12,500 to 65,000 acres. The importance of tobacco as a cash crop grew apace. Despite the rising popularity of Bright Leaf, however, the new crop did not completely replace cotton in the Pee Dee. Farmers learned that cotton and tobacco could be compatible on the same farm since the two crops did not conflict in their demands for labor during the planting and harvesting seasons.[32] If cotton still dominated Pee Dee agriculture at the turn of the century, tobacco was fast closing the gap. As a Pee Dee journalist later wrote: "Cotton may be King, but tobacco is Queen. Long live the Queen!"[33]

The tobacco boom was not confined only to the region's farmers. Pee Dee market towns experienced a genuine bonanza as populations and payrolls surged almost overnight. Between 1900 and 1910 the population of Timmonsville grew 198 percent, Marion grew 209 percent, Mullins 221 percent, and Lake City 286 percent. By 1904 more people worked in tobacco-related businesses in Mullins than the city's total population ten years earlier.[34]

[29]*New and Courier*, 10 September 1895.

[30]Conway *Horry Herald*, 27 July 1899.

[31]See Thomas Benton Young for Clemson College, *Tobacco Culture in South Carolina: Popular Bulletin No. 86* (Columbia: R.L. Bryan, 1904); South Carolina Experiment Station of Clemson Agricultural College, *Fortieth Anniversary Report, 1947*; also SCDA *Tobacco Report*, 1947.

[32]Pete Daniel, *Breaking the Land: The Transformation of Cotton, Rice, and Tobacco Cultures Since 1880* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985) 37.

[33]Bennettsville *Marlboro Herald-Advocate*, 31 July 1953.

[34]Bureau of the Census, *Thirteenth Census, 1919* vol. 3 Population, 649-50; Julian J. Petty, *The Growth and Distribution of Population in South Carolina* (State Planning Board, 1943) 228-29.

Banking activity is another valid economic index. Before the tobacco boom, bankers had judged Mullins too small and too poor to support a bank. The Bank of Mullins followed Bright Leaf to town in 1899, however, and the Merchants' and Planters' Bank opened there three years later. Thus, a town that had no bank at all for forty years now boasted two. [35]

A real estate boom got underway in the region as land values skyrocketed in tobacco communities. Vacant lots in Darlington worth $200 in 1896 were bringing $800 ten years later. Store buildings valued at $2000 in 1900 were changing hands for $10,000 in 1906. Predictably, farmland made splendid gains as well. A farm in the Lydia section that sold for $10,000 in 1902 brought $25,000 four years later. Tracts assessed in 1900 at $20 per acre were finding buyers at $100 per acre.[36]

Commerce thrived as tobacco money circulated, confirming the proverb that when the tide comes in, all the boats rise. New businesses, schools, churches, banks, and homes marked Pee Dee market towns. Visitors to Florence, Darlington, Mullins, and Timmonsville commented on the extraordinary growth of these communities. Sometimes enthusiasm gave way to exaggeration; seeing Timmonsville as "a young Atlanta" must have required uncommon vision.[37] Even the soberest observers, however, noticed the positive impact of the Bright Leaf boom in Pee Dee market towns. In 1896 *The State* told its readers: Today, large and rapidly increasing figures tell their own story. Tobacco farms, barns, pack houses, prizeries, warehouses, buyers, and factories are becoming a strong and representative part of our liveliest towns.[38] The pace of economic growth in the Pee Dee seems especially remarkable since the United States was suffering a general recession in the mid-1890s.

The first and second decades of the twentieth century were a time of prosperity in the Pee Dee and South Carolina. Between 1900 and 1920 deposits in South Carolina banks grew 425 percent.[39] Political events at home and abroad made the years 1911-1920 a golden decade for Pee Dee Bright Leaf. In 1911 Federal courts successfully invoked the Sherman Anti-Trust Act against the Tobacco Trust. Resulting competition among the successor companies raised leaf prices, at least for a while.[40] Furthermore, World War I had a massive impact on American farmers. Demand for American commodities, sharpened by the disruption of European agriculture and huge requirements of the Allied war effort, pushed prices to record levels. Wheat jumped 175 percent, sugar 170 percent, cotton 175 percent, and tobacco 220 percent.[41] As prices soared, growers bent to the task of meeting demand, and between 1909 and 1919 tobacco production in South Carolina tripled. Pee Dee counties poured out a veritable torrent of leaf. Output increased nearly 400 percent in

[35]John G. Sproat and Larry Schweikart, *Making Change: South Carolina Banking in the Twentieth Century* (Columbia: South Carolina Bankers Association, 1990) 193-97.

[36]*The State*, 19 April 1906.

[37]J. E. Norment, *The Pee Dee Tobacco Belt of South Carolina: A Condensed Review of the Tobacco Industry, with Special Reference to the Home Markets at Mullins, Timmonsville, Florence and Darlington* (Columbia: State Publishing, 1904) 6-13. See also *The State*, 23 October 1892.

[38]*The State*, 1 February 1896.

[39]Sproat and Schweikart, *Making Change*, figures 7 and 8, 209-10.

[40]Daniel, *Breaking the Land*, 35. On the Tobacco Trust, see Reaves Cox, *Competition in the American Tobacco Industry 1911-1932: A Study of the Effects of the Partition of the American Tobacco Company by the Supreme Court* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942).

[41]*Historical Statistics*, 208.

Chesterfield, 300 percent in Clarendon, 360 percent in Williamsburg and a stunning 660 percent in Lee County.[42] Warehouses and aftermarket services expanded to handle the trade. By 1920 no less than seventy-seven warehouses were selling tobacco in South Carolina, a number never equalled since. Some towns that never had a warehouse before the war had as many as three when the armistice was signed.[43]

Within a span of thirty-five years, influences of technology, boosterism, marketing, and war combined to bring a highly profitable cash crop to the Pee Dee. The $600 Bright Leaf pumped into the Pee Dee economy when Frank Mandeville Rogers cashed his bank draft from Danville in 1885 had become $19 million per year by 1918. The Pee Dee countryside was literally transformed. Thousands of curing barns, their furnaces winking in the black August night, bore witness to the change. But no more so than scores of warehouses, a dozen new banks, hundreds of new stores and homes, and thousands of jobs in the cities of the region. Even as the Pee Dee was approaching the zenith of its new prosperity, however, forces were emerging that would plunge the region to the nadir of despair.

[42]Computed from data in Bureau of the Census, *Thirteenth Census*, 1910, vol.7, *Agriculture*, 516-19 and *Fourteenth Census, 1920*, vol. 6, (part 2) 286-90.

[43]South Carolina Department of Agriculture, Commerce, and Industries, *Tobacco Report, 1920* (Columbia: Gonzales and Bryan, 1921) 25.

A DISCOVERY, AN ENCOUNTER, AN EXCHANGE: THE SPANISH AND THE ENGLISH IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Roberta VH. Copp
South Carolina Department of Archives and History

A generation after Columbus arrived in the Western Hemisphere, the Spanish spread out in all directions with exploring expeditions and colonizing efforts from their first settlements on the Caribbean Islands. One of the first such attempts occurred in "Las Floridas," our present-day region of the southeast, when Vasques de Ayllon and 500 other colonists established the first European settlement in North America somewhere along the Georgia-South Carolina coast. This short-lived Spanish outpost, San Miguel de Guadalupe, gave Spain her claim to this portion of the New World.

Thirteen years after the Spanish Colonists abandoned San Miquel, Hernando de Soto, fresh from his conquest of Peru, explored the southeast. His 600-man expedition passed through the heart of South Carolina in 1540, making contact with the Native American village of Cofitachequi, near present-day Camden. In 1559, another effort at settlement came to nothing when a hurricane dashed the plans of Tristan de Luna and Angel Villafane.

Three years later (1562), in response to the presence of French Hugenots in Port Royal, South Carolina, and the building of Fort Caroline, Florida (1565), Phillip II of Spain drafted his most able naval officer, Pedro Menendez de Aviles, to remove the French and establish a permanent settlement. Menendez ably carried out the royal orders: he defeated the French; built a chain of forts up the Florida peninsula; and established two towns, St. Augustine, Florida, and Santa Elena on Parris Island, South Carolina. Menendez chose Santa Elena because the site protected the bullion fleets on their voyage to Spain. Santa Elena served as the capital of Las Floridas until 1587, when Sir Francis Drake's plunder of Caribbean communities forced the militarily over-extended Spanish to withdraw to St. Augustine.[1] Interestingly, a child born at Santa Elena - and children were born there during

[1]Scardaville, Michael C. "The Spanish Legacy in South Carolina" (Summary of Elderhostel Program. Columbia, SC: Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism, 1991).

the twenty-year life of the town - would have been a grandparent when the English arrived at Jamestown.

A major part of Spain's effort on its colonial frontiers centered on Christianizing the natives. The Spanish friars followed a Native American policy based on religion and agriculture and established a chain of missions that extended from Florida along the Atlantic seaboard to the Chesapeake Bay and inland across northern Florida and Georgia. Although not all these missions flourished or survived, by 1660 stable missions did exist across Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina in Spanish provinces called Guale, Timucua, and Apalache. The Spanish developed a second policy out of necessity; to protect the core of the Spanish Empire, the Caribbean Basin and the wealth contained in the lands around it, it sacrificed the outlying periphery settlements. Consequently, the missionaries and the military post at St. Augustine, although weakened, exerted Spanish influence in South Carolina until the mid-eighteenth century. While the withdrawal of the Spanish to Florida allowed England to gain a foothold on the North American continent in 1608, this Spanish presence slowed English colonization efforts.[2]

North America, and in particular the southeast, was only one region of the world in which the English also vied with yet another nation, France, for commercial and colonial supremacy during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Occasionally growing into a clash of arms, the two nations sought control of world trade and the areas of the world where such trade might flourish.[3] In North America, the rivalry centered on competition for Native American alliances and trade, mainly the pelts and furs that trade yielded. The lucrative trade in Native American slaves added to the trade in skins. The Native Americans themselves took prisoners, using them either as slaves or mediums of exchange. Europeans continued the practice for their own gains, often transporting Native Americans to other parts of the world.[4]

The Lords Proprietors to whom Charles II, blithely ignoring Spanish claims, granted Carolina in 1663, were representative of English businessmen cum statesmen. From England, these men directed the penetration of the western wilderness in Carolina with the aim of making a profit. They simultaneously solved the land shortage problem of their West Indian planters, especially in Barbados, by offering the planters new lands to settle. The Barbadians had a special advantage, they carried their lively hatred of the Spanish with them.[5]

Captain William Hilton, sent by Barbadians to explore the coast of Carolina from Cape Fear South southward, "discovered" Port Royal in September 1663. During the ship's stay in the sound, two Native Americans came on board, said they were from St. Ellens (Santa Elena), and spoke many words of Spanish. This first encounter, interestingly related

[2]Crane, Verner W. *The Southern Frontier 1670-1732.* (Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 1929. Reprint. Ann Arbor, MI: Ann Arbor Paperbacks, 1959), 8-9.

[3]Hoffman, Paul E. *The New Andalucia and a Way to the Orient: The American Southeast During the Sixteenth Century.* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1990), 144-168.

[4]Crane, *The Southern Frontier* 18-19.

[5]Crane, *The Southern Frontier* 4-5.

in Capt. Hilton's words, brought to light that Spaniards from St. Augustine were in the area to rescue English castaways whom the Native Americans had in custody. The event led to the first exchange of correspondence between the Spanish and the English in South Carolina. Fortunately, one of the English castaways spoke Spanish and translated the written messages, some in coal, that were sent back and forth. Hilton brought some of English castaways aboard ship in exchange for Native Americans whom he had detained; two of these Port Royal Native Americans, Shadoo and Alush, returned with Hilton to Barbados. Hilton and his men visited a Native American settlement on land (present-day Parris Island) and observed the large cross in the front of the great house. Although the Spanish captain asserted that the town was one of Infidels, he simultaneously claimed the allegiance of these Infidels as "Naturals who had given their obedience to the King, our Master."[6]

In 1666 Robert Sanford, Secretary and Chief Registrar for the Lords Proprietors, led a second English exploration of Port Royal and surrounding coastal areas. It, too, was termed "a discovery." During his stay on the Carolina coast Sanford met Hilton's Shadoo, who conducted him to his Native American town. On Parris Island, Sandford also observed and described the Spanish cross. The natives gave Sanford a warm and friendly reception, and to encourage this feeling of amity and mutual respect Sanford left a member of his expedition, Dr. Henry Woodward, in the town and took a native with him, that they might learn each other's languages.[7] By 1666, and again in 1670, the tribes of Edisto and Kiawah had begun to hope that the English would settle in their midst and give them the protection the Spanish no longer provided, especially against the dreaded Westo tribe.[8] Both Hilton and Sanford in their narratives described this sentiment as well as the land of the Province Carolina, formerly called Florida. Given their glowing account, from the fields of maize growing in fertile soils to the abundance of hardwoods, one can readily understand why settlers migrated to this bountiful, beautiful land.[9]

And migrate they did. After numerous vicissitudes, the first English settlers arrived on the Carolina coast at Bull's Bay on March 15, 1670. The English received a friendly greeting from the Native Americans in broken Spanish, showing again how far Spain's influence extended. The cacique of Kiawah appeared and urged Governor Sayle, as he had urged Sanford four years earlier, to consider settling along the Ashley River. He accompanied the English as they sailed for Port Royal, where other Native Americans confirmed reports that the Westoes had recently ravaged the countryside as far north as the Ashley. The English newcomers with their cannons and guns were seen as saviors who could stop the incursions by this aggressive tribe that lived along the Savannah River. The

[6]"A Relation of a Discovery by William Hilton, 1664" in Salley, Alexander S., *Narratives of Early Carolina, 1650-1706.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911), 37-57. "Hilton's Discovery" in *Collections of the South Carolina Historical Society.* Volume V. (Charleston, SC: South Carolina Historical Society, 1897) 20 (note) and 170 (note).

[7]"A Relation of a Voyage on the Coast of the Province of Carolina, 1666 by Robert Sanford in Salley, *Narratives* 82-108. "The Port Royal Discovery" in *Collections* V 57-82.

[8]Crane, *The Southern Frontier* 6.

[9]"A Relation" by Hilton and "A Relation" by Sanford in Salley *Narratives* 37-41, 83-107.

favorable reports from the sloop sent to scout the Ashley, the low ground, and proximity of the Spanish to Port Royal, induced the settlers to move up the coast and found their first town in Kiawah along the Ashley.[10]

Even as the English began the settlement on Albemarle Point, Native Americans captured others of their group on St. Catherine's Island, Guale. The Barbadians ventured ashore from their sloop, unaware that they were near the site of a functioning Spanish mission. The Native Americans took the group to the Spanish friars who turned them over to the authorities in St. Augustine. The Spanish accused the Barbadians of piracy and lack of proper credentials and detained them until Lord Ashley intervened with the Spanish ambassador.[11] It is also possible that the Spanish held the English Barbadians captive to stop them from spreading the word of St. Augustine's weaknesses. Nonetheless, this encounter was one of many such exchanges between the two settlements concerning either the exchange of prisoners or those merely being held in custody. Later, these exchanges involved the slaves and indentured servants who sought refuge in St. Augustine and to whom the Spanish granted freedom upon conversion to Roman Catholicism. Often, the Spanish paid the English for these runaways.[12]

The Barbadians of Charles Town, as the English settlement called itself, concentrated on erecting defenses against Spanish attacks during its first summer.[13] This apprehension was warranted, for in August the friendly Native Americans warned that the Spanish were preparing to attack. The valuable services of Dr. Henry Woodward, recently returned from an expedition to Cofitachequi, now bore fruit. It was his friends from Parris Island who brought the warning. The danger was exaggerated, but real. Governor Guerra sent a small Spanish fleet to starve out the new settlement by blocking the harbor entrance. As an added threat, Guale Indians hovered at Stono Inlet, but a storm dragged the Spanish anchors, and the ships withdrew. The Spanish Native Americans disappeared when the English ship, *Carolina*, arrived.[14]

At St. Augustine, Zendoya replaced Guerra as Governor. In spite of the treaty of 1670, which gave the English the right to colonize *only* Charles Town and its immediate surroundings, Zendoya sought to remove the English. He did so with the Spanish queen's authorization, as long as he did not break the articles of peace. But because help from the Viceroy and Havanna were not forthcoming, the San Jorge (Charles Town) campaign came to nought.[15]

Meanwhile, the new Carolinians hoped that their strategic position and the declining prestige of Spain among the Native American tribes on the coast would allow them to

[10]"Mr. Carteret's Relation" in *Collections* V 165-168.

[11]Crane, *The Southern Frontier* 10. *Collections* V 169-174, 204-209.

[12]"A List of Dispatches of Spanish Officials Bearing on Free Negroes in the Archives of the Indies, Sevilla, Spain," *Journal of Negro History* 9 (April 1924): 144-145. *Journal of the Common House of Assembly, 1703.* (Columbia, SC: Historical Commission of South Carolina by the State Printing Company, 1907) 80-1. (Hereinafter cited as *JCHA*)

[13]Joseph West to Lord Ashley, 29 June 1670, in *Collections* V. 173-4 (note).

[14]Council to the Proprietors, 9 September 1670 in *Collections* V. 178-81. H. Woodward to Sir John Yeamans, 10 September 1670 in *Collections* V. 186-88.

[15]Crane, *The Southern Frontier* 10-1.

expand to the south among the Guale. William Owen declared "Our Owne Indians Looke upon it something strange that we do not goe to Wallie and shoote as they call it, that they may come along." The dilemma the English colonists faced was how to maintain their reputation of protection among the friendly tribes without violating the peace terms.[16]

By 1672 the English had strengthened old Charles Town against attack by erecting a palisade enclosing thirty acres across the point and by organizing six companies of militia. Surrounded by the hospitable Cusabo, the Guale tribes, and the remarkable, warlike Westo, the Carolina colony formed its Native American policy by agreeing to relations with the Westo tribe for the next decade. Through trade with Virginia, the Westoes had obtained guns and ammunition, making them formidable against the bow-and-arrow armed tribes of Carolina and Guale.[17]

The chief role of establishing contacts and exploring inland fell to Dr. Henry Woodward. A variety of motives led this man and others to explore the interior, such as land, perhaps mines, Native American wars, and Native American trade.[18] In order to secure the settlement, Lord Ashley urged the colonists to stick to planting and cattle raising while he encouraged Woodward quietly to explore inland in hopes of finding treasure. Ashley, however, did not want the ventures to cause conflict with Florida, for he was attempting to establish a secret trade with St. Augustine. Ashley was not alone in the hope that trade relations could be set up between the Spanish and the English; other proprietors and governors also tried unsuccessfully to accomplish this mutually advantageous goal. In 1674 Ashley ordered Woodward to "settle a trade withe the Indians for furs and other commodities," but it was left up to Woodward to determine whether the Westoes or Kashitas, a nation purported to have pearls and silver, would prove to be the most advantageous allies. Woodward journeyed to the Westoes that year and opened trade from Ashley's St. Giles plantation for "deerskins, furs, and young Indian slaves." Until 1680 this alliance supplied the Westoes with arms while they, in return, were expected to protect the colony from the Spanish and all other potential enemies.[19]

On the fringes of the settlement, the settlers and the tribes frequently clashed during Charles Town's first decade. Out of these exchanges developed the traffic in Native American slaves. Common frontier incidents such as encroaching on Native American lands and settlers' cattle destroying Native American crops provoked reprisals. On the other hand, settlers complained of Native American hunters killing their cattle and hogs. Sometimes Englishmen were murdered, and if the Native Americans did not immediately return satisfaction, the government sent out punitive expeditions. On top of it all, the proprietors saw Spanish intrigues, real and imagined, as their foremost irritant.[20] Perhaps these frictions were inevitable, but the proprietors, although they did not want constant war disrupting their colonial venture, used the minor wars to enslave the Native Americans. The

[16]William Owen to Lord Ashley, 15 September 1670 in *Collections* V 196-202.
[17]Crane, *The Southern Frontier* 11-2.
[18]*Collections* V 188 (note).
[19]*Collections* V 327-8, 442-3.
[20]Wallace, David Duncan. *The History of South Carolina*. Volume I. (New York: The American Historical Society, Inc., 1934) 80-1.

taking of Native American prisoners, originally used to secure the frontier, became a flourishing business and later gave the colonists a way to encroach on the French and Spanish spheres of influence.[21]

The Spanish became aware of the expanding English sphere of influence as early as 1675. A Yuchi woman, who had escaped from Carolina slavery, reported in Apalache that the Englishmen were teaching the Westoes to attack Florida and destroy Timucua and Apalache.[22] By 17 Woodward had also treated with the Kashitas and established a monopoly of trade with both warlike tribes.[23] It was not until 1680, however, that the Carolinians actively began to incite a series of Native American incursions into Guale.[24] The decade of expansion from 1670 to 1680 raised two controversial issues, the Native American slave trade and the proprietors' monopoly on inland trade. Both were involved in the resulting Westo War. With the aid of the Savannah tribe, newly arrived migrants from the west, the English had defeated the Westoes by 1683, without "much blood shed, or money split" according to John Oldmixon.[25] At the close of this war, the proprietors' monopoly was ended, the Savannahs became the primary English allies, the Westoes disappeared and, more significant, the colonists were free to push their gains as fast and far as they dared.[26]

Expansion began in earnest after 1680 with a series of Carolina-incited Native American raids against the Spanish tribes and missions along the Georgia coast. Although protested by St. Augustine, and a punitive force supposedly organized, the Spanish retreat had begun. As a result, the English drove the Spanish Native Americans far inland and the missions further south, causing the migration of war-like Yemassees into the Port Royal vicinity in 1684. Into this same area the proprietors thrust a settlement of Scots at Stuart's Town, near present day Beaufort, to act as a buffer between Charles Town and St. Augustine. These Scots soon developed a lively trade with the Native Americans, aggressively forbidding the English to engage in trade between St. Helena's and the Savannah River. Equally aggressive toward the Spanish, the Scots annexed the Georgia coastal islands and armed the Yemassees against the Spanish missions. In 1685 raiders completely crossed Guale to Timucua and were met upon their return by the Scots, eager to purchase the plunder.[27]

In the following year the Spanish took their revenge. A 150- man force of Spanish, mulattos, and Native Americans destroyed Stuart Town, with its population of 25 men, all but three of whom escaped. This force then moved toward Charleston, taking a few

[21]Crane, *The Southern Frontier* 17-8.

[22]Reding, Katherine. "Plans for the Colonization and Defense of Apalache," *Georgia Historical Quarterly*. IX (June 1925): 174-5.

[23]Entry Book of Instructions, Articles, etc., May 1663-October 1697. Colonial Records Project. Colonial Office Papers, Class 5, 1663-1710. British Manuscript Project Microfilm. D 353, CO 5/286, p. 120. South Carolina Department of Archives and History. Columbia, South Carolina. (Hereinafter cited as Entry Book BMP).

[24]Crane, *The Southern Frontier* 17.

[25]Salley, *Narratives* 329.

[26]*Collections* V 461 (note). Salley, *Narratives* 183-4(note). Wallace, *The History of South Carolina*. I. 101.

[27]Crane, *The Southern Frontier* 24-31.

prisoners, and destroying or stealing much property.[28] For instance, Paul Grimball, in a detailed inventory which reads more like the inventory of a wealthy man than a beleaguered settler, listed losses totaling £1156, which included an indentured servant girl who had not returned.[29] The Spanish withdrew before the militia could organize, but a bad storm, which occurred almost simultaneously, caused more damage than the intruders themselves. The timely arrival of Governor James Colleton checked the Carolinians' retaliatory, punitive expedition, but the colonial assembly demanded satisfaction of 16,000 pieces of eight. The matter was complicated by Spain at this time being allied with England.[30] The English policy of non-intervention on behalf of the colonists embittered them, as they regarded as an enemy anyone who received their runaway slaves, burned their houses, or impeded their trade. On the other hand, the Spanish intimated that the Carolinians had incurred their wrath by harboring pirates and privateers who preyed on the Spanish treasure fleet.[31] The Spanish and Carolina governors managed to smooth over affairs on the coast, and this continual encounter/conflict of interests shifted to the backwoods of the Chatahoochee.[32]

Dr. Henry Woodward precipitated the next conflict by pushing west to the lower Creeks, which brought into that area a Spanish force. Here, Spain tried to save her missions and prestige from the destruction that had occurred on the Georgia coast by using violence and mercilessly destroying the Native American towns that dealt with the Carolinians. For five years, from 1685 - 1691, Woodward still made his way annually to the Creeks and returned to Charleston with trains of Native American bearers loaded with skins in spite of Spanish military resistance. By 1691 Spain was deprived of the interior as it had been of the coast. Protests to the Carolina government brought wishes for peace and assertions of English rights to the disputed territories, even requests that the Spanish no longer send "white persons among our Indians, lest you make the quarrel national. . . ." The Creek trade thus established became the chief branch of Native American trade until the Yemassee War in 1715.[33]

During the years that Woodward was establishing this profitable trade among the Native Americans, the French were attempting to confine the English to the territory east of the Appalachian mountains. When French pioneers founded Mobile in 1702 and New Orleans sixteen years later, they found that Charles Town traders had already established commercial relations with the Chickasaws located between the Tennessee and Mississippi Rivers. This alliance not only caused friction but effectively restricted France's advance into the interior from Mobile and New Orleans as well, much as the alliance with the Creeks had pushed the Spanish out of Georgia.[34]

[28]Entry Book 1674-1684, BMP. D355, CO 5/288, p. 121; Minutes, D 356, CO 5/326, p. 160.

[29]Entry Book 1674-1687, BMP. D354, CO 5/287, p. 140.

[30]"Paul Grimball's Losses by the Spanish Invasion in 1686," *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*. 29. (July 1928):231-37.

[31]Rivers, William J. *A Sketch of the History of South Carolina*. (1856. Spartanburg, SC: The Reprint Company, 1972.) Appendix 425; 444.

[32]Crane, *The Southern Frontier* 33.

[33]Ibid. 33-6; 38-9. For a full account of this period see Bolton, Herbert E., "Spanish Resistance to the Carolina Traders in Western Georgia (1680-1704), *The Georgia Historical Quarterly*. IX (June 1925): 115-130.

[34]Ibid. 41-6.

It was this system of Native American alliances created by the Charles Town traders that enabled the English to break the power of Spain and check the power of France during Queen Anne's War, also called the War of Spanish Succession, 1702-1713.[35] Using news of the war to attack St. Augustine, Governor James Moore dealt a blow to both the Spanish and their French allies. Careful planning went into the expedition, and the Assembly sought as much advice and intelligence as it could muster, including interviewing Ann Ferdinando, who had lately been in St. Augustine.[36] Successfully landing in Florida, Moore burned towns and besieged the fortress at St. Augustine for eight weeks. He quickly retreated, however, when Spanish reinforcements appeared by sea. For the next year, the Commons House of Assembly debated the failed expedition, especially who should pay for it, how much plunder and how many prisoners had been taken, and how profits from the sale of this plunder were to be divided. During this time Moore, at his own expense, led a force of 50 whites and a thousand Native Americans and laid waste to Timucua. The Carolinians wholly destroyed this prosperous region which stretched from St. Augustine to present-day Tallahassee in 1704.[37] The 1706 combined French/Spanish retaliatory attack on Charles Town failed so completely that a large part of the attacking force remained as prisoners of the English. A year later a few English at the head of Carolina Native Americans burned Pensacola and entered the fort before being driven off. At the same time, the South Carolina Assembly voted as an "absolute necessity" the removal of the French at Mobile. To the Carolinians' regret, Queen Anne's war ended before this plan could be implemented.[38]

The war ended in 1713, but the encounters, conflicts, and skirmishes between the Europeans and Native Americans continued. The discoveries, encounters, and exchanges of the first fifty years set the tone for what was to come later. The Charles Town settlers, originally planters and cattle-ranchers engaged in the profitable sideline of trade, created a mercantile interest second only to rice. The traders, sent out by the new merchant class, traversed a network of trade alliances and trails that penetrated over a thousand miles into the interior.[39]

As significant as the Native American Trade was to the development of Carolina, it had a far greater impact on the Native Americans. To get the wide range of commodities they desired, like English wool, guns, and rum, the Native Americans began to hunt or wage intertribal wars to obtain skins or slaves. Unfortunately, this English system was frequently marked by commercial abuse.[40] The English were too progressive and moved too fast for the Native Americans to keep pace. Under the unprogressive Spanish, the Native Americans had been able to maintain their lifestyle by taking on only a veneer of

[35]Ibid. 74. *JCHA, 1701* 40; 20.
[36]*JCHA, 1703* 80-102.
[37]Wallace, *The History of South Carolina* 1 109.
[38]*JACH, 1703* 6; 13-6; 19-28; 31-2; 35-40; 61-2; 71-3; 92; 104; 116; 126.
[39]Crane, *The Southern Frontier* 91-8; 101.
[40]Ibid. 109-17.

Christianity.[41]

When William Hilton arrive in Port Royal Sound in 1663, he "discovered" a Spanish-Native American system based on agriculture and missions guarded by a few soldiers. It was a passive but generally easy-going and kind system. Florida lacked the mines and vast estates that had brought exploitation to other parts of the Spanish-American Empire. Furthermore, Spaniards refrained from arming the Native Americans with guns and ammunition. Both Spanish and French mingled and lived with the Natives, while the religious influences of the friars and priests mitigated cheating, friction, and licentiousness. The English encounters with the Native Americans, the Spanish, and still later with the French wrought changes from exchanges. The more aggressive English system tended to destroy the easy Spanish Native American way of life, and unfortunately, left nothing in its place. Instead of living among the natives, English migrations,spurred by the trade system, dispossessed the Native Americans of their lands.

Described in the original documents with words far more graphic than those employed here, the beginning of the Province of Carolina, formerly called Florida, excites the imagination as well as it provokes profound thought. What would the world be like without these discoveries, encounters, and exchanges? What was the ultimate result of this fifty year period in South Carolina when English ways replaced those of the Spanish? That is perhaps best expressed by David Duncan Wallace, "Unprogressive Spain oppressed the natives; the progressive Anglo Americans destroyed or expelled them."[42]

[41]Wallace, *The History of South Carolina*. I. 102-3.
[42]Ibid. 103.

"O SIR HE IS FROM SOUTH CAROLINA:" MIGRATION AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY; SOUTH CAROLINA AND MISSISSIPPI AS A CASE STUDY

Bruce Mactavish
University of Mississippi

> I have a preacher in one of the circuits in my district who is a So Carolinian and was raised in Darlington Dist. (Rev. Geo. F. Thompson) but has become a preacher since he came to the West. He amused me a few weeks ago by showing how South Carolinaish he is. At one of my Quarterly Meetings I was somewhat in doubt as to who should be appointed to preach to the colored people when he named a preacher who was a stranger to me and on my making some inquiries as to his character and qualifications he made only this reply,"*O sir he is from South Carolina.*" He seemed really to think that that was quite recommendation enough.[1]

These are the words of the Reverend M. J. Blackwell, a Methodist preacher serving in north Mississippi in the year 1853. This retelling of the incident is in a letter Blackwell wrote to his brother in Sumter County, South Carolina. The story was meant to entertain the reader just as the haughty 'South Carolinaish' description amuses us today. However, the circumstances of the incident provide numerous clues to aid us in understanding the particular values of these slaveholding clergymen. While we do not know if the stated

[1]M. J. Blackwell to Edmund Blackwell, June 21, 1853, Charles Stubblefield Collection. Archives and Special Collections, J. D. Williams Library, University, MS. The Stubblefield Collection is a group of photocopied letters, additional manuscript letters between the same brothers can be found in the Edmund Blackwell Collection, The Special Collections Department, William R. Perkins Library, Duke University, Durham, NC.

qualification of a birthplace in South Carolina got the candidate his appointment, we can be more certain of the intentions of these men. This group of Methodist clergy was carrying out in the newly settled frontier society of northern Mississippi the duty of the Mission to the slaves in a manner consistent with the older seaboard South. In doing so, according to historian Donald Mathews, ". . . "Evangelicals best stated their claim to the trust, respect, and leadership of southerners in making an orderly and benevolent social system."[2] These Methodist ministers were as intent as all other evangelicals in accomplishing the two stated goals of individual salvation and ". . . replacing the disorder of the world with the order of 'Christian society.'"[3]

In recent years the study of migration from the older seaboard states of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia to the southern frontier of Alabama, Mississippi and Texas has generated considerable controversy.[4] Joan E. Cashin argues that the planters who migrated to the southwest were young men who felt frustrated and stifled by family ties. Their decision to move, which was driven by the desire for independence, came at the expense of their families, wives and slaves.[5] In his study of slaveholders, James Oakes places migration at the center of the ideology of southern slaveholders. The constant push for expansion and material success, which was measured in terms of land and slaves, formed "a materialistic ethos that ruled their lives."[6] Janet Turner Censer finds that ". . . the West served as a safety valve for the seaboard planters with numerous progeny: The rich virgin land provided a place where the younger generation could seek prosperity."[7] But Censer's portrait of the migrating planter remains, in her words, "more mundane" and less dramatic than those of either Cashin or Oakes.[8]

All of these studies fail to adequately consider the complexity and diversity of society on the new frontiers of the west. Success or failure of the migrant is measured primarily in terms of the increase or decrease of property holdings. Such an approach is too narrow, for it fails to treat the migration question to its fullest extent - that is, it ignores the expansion of southern society from the established states to the frontier states. A new approach which studies the question of migration in economic terms but also pays close

[2]Donald G. Matthews, *Religion in the Old South* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), 137, see also his Chapter Four "We Who Own Slaves Honor God's Law," and *Slavery and Methodism: A Chapter in American Morality, 1780-1845* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965). Two important historians offer their interpretations of southern religion and southern leadership in Eugene D. Genovese and Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, "The Religious Ideals of Southern Slave Society," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 70 (Spring 1986), 1-16. The most comprehensive overview and bibliography on the topic is John B. Boles, "The Discovery of Southern Religious History," in Boles and Evelyn Thomas Nolen, eds., *Interpreting Southern History: Historiographical Essays in Honor of Sanford Higginbotham* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 1987).

[3]Matthews, *Religion in the Old South*, 40.

[4]See Jane Turner Censer, "Southwestern Migration among North Carolina Planter Families: 'The Disposition to Emigrate,'" *Journal of Southern History* 72 (August 1991) 407-426; Joan E. Cashin, *A Family Venture: Men and Women on the Southern Frontier* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991); James Oakes, *The Ruling Race: A History of American Slaveholders* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982); Donald F. Shaeffer, "A Statistical Profile of Frontier and New South Migration: 1850-1860," *Agricultural History* 59 (October 1985) 563-578.

[5]Cashin, *A Family Venture*, 32-52.

[6]Oakes, *The Ruling Race*, 69.

[7]Censer, "Southwestern Migration among North Carolina Planter Families," 422.

[8]Censer, "Southwestern Migration among North Carolina Planter Families," 422.

attention to the actions of the migrants once they have settled and begun to create new communities should prove useful to our understanding of the individual migrants as well as the society they created.

This essay will examine the contest for leadership and struggle for control of society on the frontiers of antebellum northern Mississippi, an area of the South which was the last portion east of the Mississippi River to be opened for settlement. The battle pitted the conservative social order and values espoused by evangelicals, Whigs, and yeomen, against a new social order based on "individualism, competition and risk taking" as articulated by a group of young aggressive planters and described by Oakes and Cashin.[9] One way to assess the attitudes and intentions of migrants is to examine social life in northern Mississippi. A conspicous lack of institutions such as churches and schools, an absent or feeble community life, and the loss of significant kinship ties all support the conclusion that an existing population was dominated by "unbridled materialism," in which "ruthless disregard for human relationships" was the norm.[10] On the other hand, frequent calls for a traditional ordering of life on the frontier suggest that other ideals were also at work.

This essay will utilize the writings of two South Carolinians, M. J. Blackwell (twenty-nine letters written from 1836 to 1859) and Samuel Andrew Agnew (his diary), as well as manuscript census data, to argue that in antebellum north Mississippi both types of societies and their representative sets of values coexisted. This coexistence was not a peaceful one. It often produced dramatic tensions in the lives of individuals and within society as a whole.[11]

The varied landscape of north Mississippi was the battle field upon which the struggle for control of the direction of society took place. Suitability of the soil to support the large scale cultivation of cotton with slave labor proved to be a crucial factor in determining who was attracted to an area and what kind of society was established.[12] The three counties in the northeast corner of the state, Tishomingo, Itawamba, and Calhoun, were hilly, and the soil largely unsuitable for significant cotton cultivation. These counties were dominated by

[9]Cashin, *A Family Venture*, 32.

[10]Cashin, *A Family Venture*, 119.

[11]The literature on the southern community is extensive and growing. Some of the more important works which finds this characterization to be true are: Lacy K. Ford, *Origins of Southern Radicalism: The South Carolina Upcountry, 1800-1860* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988) Chapters 1 and 2; Steven H. Hahn, *The Roots of Southern Populism: Yeoman Farmers and the Transformation of the Georgia Upcountry, 1850-1890* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983) Chapters 1 and 2. An important work which quantifies the community is Orville Vernon Burton, *In My Father's House are Many Mansions: Family and Community in Edgefield, South Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985).

[12]For a discussion of how this tension affected southern society in the postbellum period see Ted Ownby, *Subduing Satan: Religion, Recreation and Manhood in the Rural South, 1865-1920* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1990). For an extensive interpretive review of Ownby's book see Samuel S. Hill in *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 75 (Summer 1991) 370-384.

small farmers to whom the traditional style of subsistence agriculture was the first priority.[13] Slaves constituted 20% of the population of these counties.[14]

The landscape of the seven counties in north-central Mississippi, Tippah, Pontotoc, Chickasaw, Marshall, Lafayette, Panola, DeSoto, was hilly in places and the soil poor, but along numerous rivers and streams the soil was quite fertile and suitable for large-scale cotton production. In 1860 almost exactly one half of the people in these seven counties were slaves.[15]

The third region to be treated in this study is the forty-mile-wide delta that runs along the Mississippi River. The soil here was as rich as any in the South, but during the antebellum years its two counties, Tunica and Coahoma, were only partially cultivated because of the yearly floods and the difficulty and expense involved in clearing and draining the cypress swamps.[16] The white population was much lower as evidenced by the percentage of slaves in the area: 89% in 1860.[17] As this cursory summary of the subregions of north Mississippi indicates, the most visible difference is the racial composition of the counties; in the hills slaves were two out of ten people, in the middle counties five of ten, and in the delta nine of ten.

The expansion of the cotton kingdom in northern Mississippi was not an even process.[18] The cotton production for the year 1836 was less than 3,000 bales, which amounted to less than 1% of the state's crop.[19] Only three years later cotton production had risen to 13,000 bales, or 3% of the state's production.[20] In the decade of the 1840s cotton production in north Mississippi increased almost nine-fold, and the 1850 crop came in at 113,000 bales, accounting for 23% of the state's cotton production.[21] By 1860 cotton production in the twelve county region had increased to 250,000 bales, or 20% of the state's production.[22]

Over the years, land prices and land values rose in all counties. The average price per acre of land in the region in 1860 was about twelve dollars.[23] In the delta counties of Tunica and Coahoma, those most affected by the cotton boom, the average price rose from nine dollars an acre in 1850 to thirty-five and thirty-two dollars per acre respectively in

[13]Antebellum agriculture in Mississippi is treated in Herbert Weaver, *Mississippi Farmers, 1850-1860* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1945); John H. Moore, *Agriculture in Antebellum Mississippi* (New York: 1958) and Moore, *The Emergence of the Cotton Kingdom in the Old Southwest, Mississippi, 1770-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988).

[14]A new study looks at the persistence of yeomen values in postbellum politics in these north Mississippi counties is Michael R. Hyman, *The Anti-Redeemers: Hill Country Political Dissenters in the Lower South from Reconstruction to Populism* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1991).

[15]United States Bureau of the Census, *Eighth Census of the United States, 1860.*

[16]The north delta frontier is the location of a novel which portrays the protagonist wrestling a cotton kingdom from the swamps, John Faulkner, *Dollar Cotton* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1942).

[17]*Eighth Census.*

[18]For a similar description concerning the entire south see Hahn, *The Roots of Southern Populism*, 17-18.

[19]*Besancon's Annual Register of The State of Mississippi for the Year 1838. Compiled from the Original Documents and Annual Survey* (Natchez: L. A. Besancon, 1838) 99-101. Four counties did not report their production.

[20]*Sixth Census 1840.*

[21]*Sixth Census, 1840.* 228.

[22]*Seventh Census, 1850,* 264.

[23]*Eighth Census, 1860,* 85. Computed by the author.

1860.[24] Land prices rose at a steady pace in all of north Mississippi during the 1850s, but the most dramatic increases occurred in the delta counties of Tunica and Coahoma. In a three-year period in the middle 1850s land value in Tunica county more than doubled, and in Coahoma county prices tripled.[25]

Despite the price increases throughout the 1850's, farmers in the hill counties largely refrained from production of significant amounts of cotton for the market. For example, in Itawamba County in 1850, while seven in ten farmers grew some cotton, only two in ten grew more than five bales of cotton, and only three percent grew more than twenty bales.[26] The average cotton production per capita remained low throughout the period as did a measure of crop specialization, the cotton-to-corn ratio.[27] Together these statistics indicate that cultivation of cotton for the market was not an economic priority for these farmers.[28]

The power of the forces of the cotton boom to reshape the lives of those who became involved can be seen in many different examples. James E. Matthews of DeSoto County reported in a letter to his sister in 1858 that he and his two brothers were all "improving . . . Circumstances fast," and future prospects looked even better. "We are living in a flourishing country that abounds with *Negroes, Mules, and Cotton*. . . ." All three of the brothers were involved in the sale of land in the "Mississippi River Swamp."[29] Matthews wrote of his own health problems and of those of his brothers, all of which he attributed to the fact that "In examining those lands, and surveying them out among the Cane Breaks I am greatly exposed, and often excessively fatigued...."[30] But Matthews was also concerned with other problems which accompanied the improved circumstances of his siblings. He was particularly disturbed by his brother Joseph and confided in their sister the nature of his worries: "He is becoming very rich in this worlds goods. God grant that he may not become

[24]Presley and Scofield, *Real Estate Values*, 54-55.

[25]Figures are from Moore, *Emergence of the Cotton Kingdom*, Appendix 1, 294-296. He cites a table which appeared in the Jackson *Mississippian*, August 10, 1858.

[26]These figures are from a data base created by the author using a Macintosh personal computer. The first step was to select every fourth household listed in the population schedule of the manuscript census. This resulted in a total of 453 households. Next, the household heads were tracked to the agricultural schedule of the manuscript census for Itawamba County and 350 households were matched (77% of all households and 91% of the 385 household heads which were listed as "Farmers" in the population schedule). Of these 350 farms a total of 240 (68%) grew some cotton in 1850, 38 farms (16%) grew five or more bales and 7 farms (3%) produced 20 or more bales.

[27]The cotton-to-corn ratio is computed by dividing the pounds of cotton by the bushels of corn.

	1850	
	Cotton-to-Corn Ratio	*Per Capita Cotton*
Tishomingo	2.9	.3
Itawamba	4.1	.4
	1860	
Tishomingo	5.2	.5
Itawamba	7.8	.7

[28]This interpretation follows the finding of Hahn, *The Roots of Southern Populism*, and differs from the interpretation of Ford, *The Origins of Southern Radicalism*.

[29]James E. Matthews to Hannah W. Campbell, March 16, 1858, Matthews Letters, Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Jackson.

[30]All quotes from James E. Matthews to Hannah W. Campbell, March 16, 1858, Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Jackson.

poor in the things which pertain to his immortal interests."[31] The cotton boom created an increased demand for slave labor. In the three-year period from 1854 to 1857 the increase in the slave population followed closely that of land prices. The number of taxable slaves in north Mississippi rose sixteen percent during these years. In the delta counties of Tunica and Coahoma the increase was much higher, fifty percent and ninety percent respectively. Although some of the increase could have come from within the region, many slaves were brought to the delta from the older seaboard states.[32] For example, former slave Tabby Abbey told the story of her forced migration to the Mississippi delta. It is one of separation from family, friends, and the place of her birth and childhood, and of a life of work in the same unhealthy delta environment described by Matthews. Abbey told the following story to an interviewer in the 1930s:

> I wuz born in Richmond, Va. in 1833 and lived there til I wuz 16 years old. My Marster dar . . . sold me to Mr. Jim Abbey, long wid a whole passel o' udder niggers, he ca'ied us to Mobile and kep' us dere tilde fros' fell: den he car'ied us down to de Mississippi Bottom close to Tunica, to work on a plantation he owned der.[33]

This rapid expansion was troubling to those who wanted a stable and developed society with schools, churches and a civicly responsible citizenry. In 1845 a strong Whig

[31]James E. Matthews to Hannah W. Campbell, March 16, 1858, Matthews Letters, Mississippi Department of Archives and History. M. J. Blackwell offered this assessment of some of the rich Methodists: "If they were as rich in grace as in temporalities what a place it would be, but also rich men seldom have time to serve the Lord." M. J. Blackwell to Edmund Blackwell, February 15, 1849, Stubblefield Collection.

[32]There is a total of 94 W. P. A. ex-slave narratives for the twelve north Mississippi counties. These 94 narratives were examined to find out the birthplace of the slaves and their parents or other family members mentioned. These numbers match to a remarkable degree the birthplaces of whites who migrated to Mississippi during the same period, giving further credence to slave narratives as reliable historical sources. For a statistical analysis of the birthplaces of whites in Mississippi see Weaver, *Mississippi Farmers*, 28. For the most complete study of the slave trade see Michael Tadman, *Speculators and Slaves: Masters, Traders, and Slaves in the Old South* (Madison and London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1987).

	Birthplace of Informant		*Birthplace of Parents and Others*	
State	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Mississippi	56	59	4	9
South Carolina	6	7	12	26
Virginia	5	6	10	22
North Carolina	4	4	6	13
All Other States	4	5	9	30
No Information	17	18		
Total	94	100	46	100

[33]Tabby Abbey, interviewed by Mrs. C. P. Wilson in George P. Rawick, *The American Slave: A Composite Autobiography*, v.6, 3.

newspaper in Panola county tried to goad local planters into action. An editor using the pen name "LAX" specifically wanted planter support for the building of churches and schools. He outlined the nature of the problem: "From the beginning until now we have been the possessors of one poor idea; our mental optics have been, and yet are, bounded by the horizon of cotton and negroes, negroes and cotton. . . ."[34] The results of such a single-minded view were clear to "LAX". "While the rest of the world is rushing forward in the rivalry of improvement, we are creeping along dreaming of-Cotton, Cotton!"[35]

The campaign did not result in any progress. The following year the editor launched a more personal and satirical attack on "men on the make" with this riddle:

> If a lady were lame in the arm, and in the left leg; if she was blind in one eye, and couldn't see with the other; if she had no teeth, and her gums were off; if she had a bump behind; and to amends was perfectly flat before; and if she was club-footed and had cancer on her nose; and if she had a 'spit-fire' temper, and forty-nine negroes with seventy-five thousand dollars cash: how many suitors would she have? Don't all speak at once![36]

While "LAX" objected to planter behavior on temporal grounds, in the eyes of evangelicals the cotton boom affected the prospects for salvation and corrupted the souls of men and women. Methodist minister M. J. Blackwell questioned the logic of many who were trying to cash in on the boom; [we] ". . . make our poor bones ache for a little property here yet blindly neglect and forget those heavenly treasures, which never fade away."[37] For, as Blackwell said, the impulse to join in the rush to grow more cotton, to own more slaves, and to own more land was a great and dangerous temptation. With apparent analogies to the sin of dancing, Blackwell wrote, "The great idol god (cotton) has soaked up its notaries in this western wood and we have truly stirring times. When the tune of nine and ten cents is well played it is rather difficult for active folks to keep from dancing."[38] Although such recreation was viewed as sinful, to dance to "the tune of nine and ten cents" and forget what was important was to dance with the devil.

Census data provide further evidence of the nature of society in the delta counties. In Tunica County in 1850 only one church had accommodations for one hundred people and

[34]Panola *Lynx*, December 20, 1845.
[35]Panola *Lynx* December 20, 1845.
[36]The Panola *Mississippi Lynx*, April 25, 1846.
[37]M. J. Blackwell to Edmund Blackwell, December 18, 1856, Stubblefield Collection.
[38]M. J. Blackwell to Edmund Blackwell, December 12, 1849, Stubblefield Collection.

property valued at $100.[39] Ten years later there were four churches with accommodations for 400 and property worth $250. The story is much the same in Coahoma County: in 1850 the county had five churches, in 1860 there were thirteen churches.[40] According to one Methodist circuit rider, the first campmeeting, the focus of Methodist evangelism efforts, was not organized in the area until after the Civil War.[41]

These cases show the most challenging aspects of the battle faced by evangelicals and their Whig allies for control of the social order. The conservative social order and evangelical beliefs, although able to overcome frontier and wilderness conditions, were less successful in establishing "the order of 'Christian society'" in counties most actively involved in the cotton boom. The lure of quick profits to be made in the delta spelled trouble for the evangelicals.

Thus far this essay has been primarily concerned with what the evangelicals sought to avoid rather than their specific wishes. Attention will now turn to that behavior which warranted the approval of the evangelicals. What was their model of correct behavior? Let us begin with the example of Tippah County farmer Elijah Thornton. Thornton was a middling sort of slaveholding farmer. His slaveholding had fallen from nine in 1840 to six in 1850.[42] In 1850 the cotton production on his one hundred improved acres (valued at $2,000) was a modest seventeen bales. In addition, his farm produced 600 bales of corn, 73 bushels of wheat, 200 bushels of oats, 40 pounds of wool, and modest amounts of peas, beans, sweet potatoes, and butter.[43] He was in all respects an example of a slaveholding yeoman farmer when he moved to Mississippi in 1838 and his status changed very little when he died in 1851. Upon his death the Academy Baptist Church in Tippah County passed a resolution holding up Thornton's
life as an example of a model of Christian behavior. The resolution read, in part:

> Bro. Elijah Thornton dec'd was one of the numbers upon which This . . . [church] was constituted eight years past. He moved to this county in the winter of 1838 from the Grove Level Church in Franklin county Georgia. He has been an orderly member of the Church of Christ for upwards of 30 years, and notwithstanding he was an industrious man and a good practicable planter. He always made his

[39]United States Bureau of the Census, *Seventh Census of the United States, 1850*, 261. The single church was a Methodist church.

[40]United States Bureau of the Census, *Seventh Census of the United States, 1850*, 261; for Coahoma County in 1850 there were accommodations for 770 and a cash value of $675. In 1860 there were 13 churches will accommodations for 2,600 and property valued at $14,600.

[41]George Washington Bachman Autobiography, typescript, 30, Mississippi Collection. He stated "After great effort succeeded in getting up a campmeeting..." in the bottom land of DeSoto and Panola counties. That first year Bachman reported only four tents at the campmeeting.

[42]Manuscript Census of 1840, Mississippi; Manuscript Census of 1850, Mississippi.

[43]Manuscript Census of 1840, Mississippi; Manuscript Census of 1850, Mississippi.

> business matters bow and bend to his relegeous duties. In short, his conduct as a church member as well as a citizen is worthy of imitation not only by his near relations and Brethren & Sister in the church but by the whole community. . . .[44]

A number of observations can be made concerning this resolution: his migration from Georgia is described in terms of passing from one church to the next; he moved hundreds of miles from his home yet remained within "Christian society"; when many others were chasing after profits to be made in the cotton boom Thornton remained in the same community and gained the reputation of a "good and practicable planter."

Perhaps most significant to this study is the description of his business practices as those which "bow and bend to his relegeous duties." The use of the phrase "relegeous duties" gives an indication of the importance of such actions to members of this church. Finally, Thornton's life is a model of behavior to be emulated not just by his family or fellow church members, but by the larger audience of the community. This is an example of how evangelicals tried directly to influence the economic behavior of the community in ways which conflicted with the prevailing boom mentality.

A second example of the behavior championed by evangelicals is found in the writing of M. J. Blackwell. In 1853 Blackwell had the chance to meet the president of the University of Mississippi, A. B. Longstreet. He described Longstreet as "a truly great and good man. With all his uncommon learning and talents he appears to be meek, humble, and with manners as simple and unostentatious as a child."[45] Such qualities of meekness, humility and unostentatiousness are not the qualities that would move a young man ahead in his pursuit of the economic independence described by Cashin or the material success discussed by Oakes. In the same letter Blackwell outlined further the character of Longstreet:

> My acquaintance with Judge Longstreet the present year has impressed my mind very forcibly with the difference betwinx a *real* and a *would-be* great man. The true greatness of the first show itself as a natural effect springing spontaneously from its cause - easy, free, simple, pure as the naturally playful glee of the artless child; . . . The actions of the would be great man are constrained. He says by his actions "Do will you just see how great a

[44]Academy Baptist Church Records, January 1851, Mississippi Department of Archives and History.
[45]M. J. Blackwell to Edmund Blackwell, October 24, 1853, Stubblefield Collection.

> man I am." Yet those actions proclaim just the reverse there is something in them out of place, not truthful.[46]

Blackwell concludes his remarks with the following question which cuts to the core of (what he sees as) the real issue: "Is it not much the best for us all to appear really what we are and be content with that?"[47] Contentment is far from the lives of "would-be great [men]," but feeling content with one's place in this world and confident of salvation in the next is at the heart of the conservative evangelical social order.

In his remarks concerning a slave called Uncle Pete, Blackwell provides a third example of exemplary behavior. Blackwell wrote:

> Each one should strive to make his mark as he passes through the world; if in no other way perhaps, he may succeed as uncle Pete, a colored man in one of my charges who in an exhortation remarked that he wanted to live in this world in such a way that uncle Pete's grave would preach to every one that passed by it. The remark was worthy of a christian philosopher.[48]

To the Reverend Blackwell, uncle Pete's statement was "worthy of a christian philosopher" because it reflected the slave's acceptance of his place in southern society, his recognition of the value of his behavior and actions, and his assurance of salvation. Statements like those of uncle Pete reinforced the evangelicals' belief in the correctness of their mission to the slaves and their position of leadership in society.

However, in many parts of northern Mississippi there was a lack of success in ". . . replacing the disorder of the world with the order of 'Christian society.'" This failure was largely due to the dynamics of the cotton boom.[49] Tension between advocates of a conservative social order and a new increasingly materialistic social order was found to be highest in those areas most involved in the cotton boom. Were any migrants successful in establishing a social order which found a balance between cotton and evangelical Christianity in the model of Lacy K. Ford's South Carolina Upcountry? The story of one family who moved from Abbeville County, South Carolina to north Mississippi seems to be such an example.

[46]M. J. Blackwell to Edmund Blackwell, October 24, 1853, Stubblefield Collection.
[47]M. J. Blackwell to Edmund Blackwell, October 24, 1853, Stubblefield Collection.
[48]M. J. Blackwell to Edmund Blackwell, February 16, 1853, Stubblefield Collection.
[49]Matthews, *Religion in the Old South*, 40.

In the early morning hours of October 25, 1852 Samuel Andrew Agnew joined a large party gathering in an old field next to Erskine College in Due West, South Carolina. The group, which consisted of Agnew's forty-three-year-old father, Enoch Agnew, and his uncle Alfred Agnew, and two other families was ready to begin its journey by horseback, wagon and foot to Tippah County, Mississippi. The morning before they departed Agnew's father had purchased two slaves from two different owners. These slaves joined dozens of other slaves making the migration. Five weeks and 444 miles later these South Carolinians arrived at their Mississippi destination and began life on the cotton frontier.[50]

The move away from the familiar landscape of South Carolina required some adjustment, as Agnew's diary entry three weeks after his arrival reveals: "When I first came here I was bewildered. Every way I looked I saw woods--no clearing. I saw for the first time bored wells saw many things which appeared very strange at first but all have become common place to me now."[51] The strange landscape of Mississippi with its old-growth forests of pine, oak, hickory, and maple had a definite effect on Agnew who came from a part of the South in which "old fields" where the soil was past its prime (like the one in which they gathered at their departure) were quite common.[52] But his adjustment to the strange landscape was possibly made easier by the presence of his family that included his father, mother, three brothers, two sister, various aunts, uncles, and cousins, as well as 53 of the neighboring 100 household heads with South Carolina birthplaces.[53] While the landscape of northern Mississippi required some acclimatization, work patterns, social activities, relations between planters and plain folk, and worship in the Corona community of Tippah County followed the pattern of similar areas in the seaboard south. Community life in this county seems to have been a successful transplant of the vibrant spirit found by Lacy K. Ford in the South Carolina Upcountry and by Steven Hahn in Georgia's Upcountry. The extent of community ties and the nature of these relations can be seen in a sampling of Samuel Agnew's diary entries in late 1860. On October 11 corn was gathered and shucked by the slaves as a group after dark. On October 18 "Mr. Lyon had a screw raising today." On October 20 Agnew went to visit a friend but found him to be out at a corn shucking. On October 21 Agnew was happy with the news that three new members had joined the New Albany Presbyterian Church - he listed the names of all three in his diary. October 25 "Walkup passed . . . on his way to Yell Co. Ark. bid he and his family long goodbye. He promised to write to me." November 2 a slave woman Eliza "brought forth a still-born child. We buried it after dinner, this making the third burial from our family in less than a month." November 3 "At Pa's request rode around to Phillips Martins Watts and McGees with the articles for the school. . . . Got 2 1/2 Schollars subscribed." November 9 "weigh load of cotton for F E Watts in the evening." November 14 "Uncle Wills Sam has

[50]Samuel Andrew Agnew Diary, October 22, 1852, November 24, 1852, Mississippi Collection. Photocopies of originals at Southern Historical Collection. Chapel Hill, NC.

[51]Agnew Diary, December 15, 1852.

[52]Description of the tree is from Elizabeth Larabee to Jay Hathaway, July 9, 1842, Larabee Letter, Mississippi Department of Archives and History.

[53]Birthplaces of neighbors computed from the 1850 population schedule of the manuscript census for Tippah County, MS.

joined the Methodist Church." December 4 "Doc Heard and others were driving deer above us today." December 9 "Go to Church and preach from 1 Cor 1:19. Small congregation: the death of M. Parks doudtless one reason."

The nature of Agnew's migration, with a large extended family and friends, and the character of the community with frequent interactions of reciprocity and mutual dependence, as outlined above, are markedly different from the model of the southwestern frontier described in the works of Cashin and Oakes. Cashin's assertion that the migrant was typically a "young man who . . . formulated a new set of social values, embracing individualism, competition, and risk taking" does not seem to match this particular northern Mississippi example.[54] However, there were some men who did fit this profile, men whose portraits have been insightfully painted and stories told by the Lafayette County novelist William Faulkner. The greed, lack of concern for his family, antagonistic relationship with much of the community and the local church of Thomas Sutpen in the tale *Absalom, Absalom* can certainly find their counterparts in the historical reality of northern Mississippi.

The story of migration from the older southern states to the frontier south is perhaps best characterized as a war within society like that waged by Sutpen on his surroundings. It was a struggle for leadership and control of the social order in which the forces of a civilizing, conservative social order based on evangelical ideals struggled against the aggressive materialism of a new social order based on the modern ideals of wealth and greed. The history of antebellum southern migration must come to terms with the existence of those who seem to fit William Faulkner's description of Thomas Sutpen while at the same time seek to understand those Yoknapatawpha men and women who, like Rosa Coldfield, found in Sutpen's design for greatness not the material of a southern success story, but the nightmare of a fatal southern tragedy.

[54]Cashin, *A Family Venture*, 32. Don H. Doyle has considered this topic in detail, "The Mississippi Frontier in Faulkner's Fiction and in Fact," *Southern Quarterly* 96 (Summer 1991) 145-160.

THE QUINCENTENARY: AN OPPORTUNITY TO DISCOVER WOMEN'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO SOUTH CAROLINA HISTORY

Marcia G. Synnott
University of South Carolina, Columbia

The 500th anniversary, in 1992, of Christopher Columbus's "discovery" of the Western Hemisphere, a world that was "new" to Europeans, presented to six women scholars at the University of South Carolina in Columbia an opportunity to develop lecture and television projects that would help to correct the negative stereotypes distorting the historical record of women and other minority groups. By shaping their questions and research in terms of Women's Studies concepts, these scholars demonstrated how women's experiences could be included in the "statement on teaching the Columbian encounter" that was developed by the National Council for Social Studies and endorsed by the American Historical Association's Teaching Division: "The encounters of Native Americans, Africans, and Europeans following 1492 are not stories of vigorous white actors confronting passive red and black spectators and victims." Far from being "passive," women participated in that "internal diversity of the Native Americans, the Africans, and the Europeans" which "contributed to the development of modern American pluralistic culture and contemporary world civilization."[1]

Funded in part by the South Carolina Humanities Council, the USC Women's Studies Project, "Women in South Carolina Through Time: Quincentennial Questions," set the following objectives:

1. To raise public consciousness of the presence and contributions of women throughout South Carolina history and culture.

[1] "AHA Endorses Quincentenary Statement," *Perspectives*, American Historical Association Newsletter, vol. 29, no. 8 (November 1991): 20-21.

2. To illustrate some of the diverse experiences of South Carolina women through time, race, and class.
3. To catalyze an ongoing public inquiry as to how the marginalization of women has not only shaped limiting stereotypes of women, but often directed national priorities away from pressing domestic issues.
4. To examine those critical issues now facing all women and their families across ethnic, racial, class, religious, and regional lines.
5. To generate audience interaction with this Women's Studies perspective.[2]

Judging from audience responses to questionnaires, each of the public presentations fulfilled these objectives.

The project was launched by a faculty panel discussion on January 21, 1992, to a USC student and faculty audience in the afternoon and to a community audience at the Columbia YWCA that night. Six USC women scholars, representing history, anthropology, social work, and women's studies, first examined gender stereotypes restricting women and the hardships and oppression they experienced and then assessed their contributions, over time, to South Carolina.

Dr. Katherine Mille, the project director and Assistant Director of the USC Women's Studies Program, introduced the panel and explained critical terms in Women's Studies discourse: "Hierarchy," "patriarchy," dualisms," "oppression," "racism," and "sexism." For example, said Mille, "if one thinks exclusively in dualisms (black/white; rich/poor; good/bad; male/female) it is very difficult to account for cultural diversity, or for characteristics, abilities, or desires shared by individuals who are supposed to be opposites." In such thinking, "characteristic of patriarchy," women and Native Americans and Africans were considered the opposite of and inferior to European men. "The negatively valued group," she argued, "whether women, blacks or Native Americans, is viewed by the dominating group as Other, as somehow less than fully human, unfit to make their own choices."[3]

Contributing to the negative valuation of Native Americans was the fact that European reactions were filtered and probably distorted by reliance, of necessity, on a series of translators. Relatively little is known, moreover, about Native American women at the time of European contact, said Dr. Gail Wagner of the USC Anthropology Department, because all the translators were men. Yet Indian women demonstrated to astute observers their "critical importance in the day-to-day life of their society"; they "supplied half, if not more,

[2] Katherine Wyly Mille, Grant proposal to the South Carolina Humanities Council, September 20, 1991.

[3] Katherine Wyly Mille, "Introduction and Women's Studies Concepts." Dr. Mille published "The case for revamping masculine, 'generic' language," part one of "a two-part series on inclusive, or non-sexist, language," in *USC Times*, The University of South Carolina System, vol. 3, no. 9 (June 5, 1992), pp. 4-5. "Sexism" Dr. Mille defined as "a form of oppression where a politically dominating group dehumanizes and exploits other people whom they categorize, define and target by sex."

of the food," by cultivating and processing crops. They should be credited, said Wagner, "as the original domesticators of many, if not most, of our plant food crops."[4]

No doubt Europeans were surprised by the fact that Southeastern Indian societies determined kinship and inheritance through women. Indeed, when Hernando De Soto traveled through this region in 1540, an Indian woman ruled over the chiefdom of Cofitachequi, which extended over the central portion of South Carolina. Two hundred years later, the differing value that Indian society placed on the advice of women in public affairs was illustrated by the following exchange between Little Carpenter and Governor William Henry Lyttelton during a meeting in Charles Towne in 1757. In reply to Little Carpenter's question whether white men admitted "'the Women into their *Councils*,'" as did the red men, the governor replied: "'The White Men do place a Confidence in their Women and share their *Counsels* with them when they know their Hearts to be good'" [Dr. Wagner's emphasis].[5]

The cultural baggage--fear, superstition, prejudice, great power rivalries--and diseases that the Spanish and other Europeans carried with them doomed the opportunity they had to create a "new world," said Dr. Joan Meznar of the USC History Department. Spain's efforts to form permanent communities by encouraging family migration, for example, to Santa Elena, its North American colonial capital, on present-day Parris Island, aroused Indian hostility. For ten years, women and children from every level of the social hierarchy, from the family of La Florida's captain-general, Pedro Menendez de Aviles, to those of farmers and artisans, struggled to survive. Finally, the women decided it was time to evacuate Santa Elena; they "literally carried the governor to the ships which ferried the survivors of a 1576 Indian attack to safety in St. Augustine." Spanish return the next year lasted only until 1587, when the inhabitants were transferred to St. Augustine. Meznar drew a parallel between the Spanish women of Santa Elena and Hispanic women in South Carolina today: "The dream of Santa Elena as a way-station between the penury of Europe and the wealth of Mexico has been transformed into the vision of South Carolina as part of the land of opportunity where one might escape the violence and poverty of Mexico, Puerto Rico, Central America."[6]

Focusing on later European immigrants, particularly on "English and French Women in South Carolina," Dr. Marcia Synnott of the USC History Department discussed the stereotypes of women and wives that Europeans brought to North America and contrasted

[4] Gail Wagner, "Once Powerful but Now Invisible: Native American Women at Contact in South Carolina." See also Patty Jo Watson and Mary C. Kennedy, "The Development of Horticulture in the Eastern Woodlands of North America: Women's Role," in *Engendering Archaeology: Women and Prehistory*, ed. by Joan M. Gero and Margaret W. Conkey (London: Basil Blackwell, 1991).

[5] Wagner, "Once Powerful but Now Invisible"; quoted from Council Journal 26, January 3rd, 1757 - May 24th, 1757; June 7th, 1757 - June 4th, 1758, pp. 45 and 53. See also Charles Hudson, *The Southeastern Indians* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1976); and Chester B. De Pratter, "Cofitachequi: Ethnohistoric and Archaeological Evidence," in *Studies in South Carolina Archaeology: Essays in Honor of Robert L. Stephenson*, ed. by G. T. Hanson and A. C. Goodyear, Archaeological Study No. 9 (Columbia: South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, 1989), pp. 133-156.

[6] Joan Meznar, "The Early Spanish Presence in South Carolina." See also Lawrence S. Rowland, *Window on the Atlantic: The Rise and Fall of Santa Elena, South Carolina's Spanish City* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives & History, 1990); and Paul E. Hoffman, *A New Andalucia and a Way to the Orient: The American Southeast During the Sixteenth Century* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1990).

them to the reality of the pioneering experience.[7] The belief that the patriarchal system provided the best order of governance for both the family and society was part of the cultural baggage crossing the Atlantic with the immigrants. "Men must be single-minded, thrusting, persistent, indomitable (unless they were servants, when they were pseudo-women)," said English historian Mary Prior, while "wives must be adaptable, ready to turn their hands to anything, selfless, patient and obedient."[8]

European women immigrants did not find "a golden age" in Colonial America, although they gained some status because of their scarcity in the earliest settlements and their crucial economic skills in processing, preserving, and cooking foods, making clothing, and in nursing and raising an average of seven to eight children. Women were appreciated, historian Glenda Riley observed, until they trespassed against "male prerogatives in a patriarchal system," particularly in public affairs, the sphere totally dominated by male authority.[9] To both men and women,

> a real American woman intrinsically was, among other things, a devoted mother, an unusually virtuous person who had to remain aloof from the corruption of politics, a domestic individual who labored most happily and productively within her own home, and a weak-minded, physically inferior being who needed guidance from stronger and wiser people--men.

"Invented" over generations, said Riley, this "model" was "resisted" by "thousands" of white women; and it "was a meaningless construct" for African American, Native American, and Oriental women, who "were often assertive and strong," instead of "being passive and weak."[10]

The reality of the immigrant experience especially challenged the model of the ideal American white woman. For example, a significant number of women immigrating to the British North American colonies were indentured servants. Paying for their passage and subsistence by selling their labor for four to five years, some of them married farmers after

[7] Marcia G. Synnott, "English and French Women in South Carolina." See also "South Carolina Women in History," 30-minute videotape presentation, a staff development program for teachers, by South Carolina Educational Television (1990). Marcia G. Synnott wrote the script and selected the images and photographs. Available through South Carolina Instructional Television, it was shown together with "Resources for South Carolina Women" and "South Carolina Women Writers."

[8] Mary Prior, "Women and the urban economy: Oxford 1500-1800," in *Women in English Society 1500-1800*, ed. by Mary Prior (London and New York: Methuen, 1985), p. 96.

[9] Glenda Riley, *Inventing the American Woman*. Vol. I: *A Perspective on Women's History 1607-1877* (Arlington Heights, IL.: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1986), p. 14.

[10] Riley, pp. 6-8, 32.

their indenture ended, but others were sexually exploited by their masters and punished for bastardy by additional years of servitude.[11]

Women who came with relatives had the economic and social support of a family, "the basic agency of settlement," but they, too, experienced many hardships.[12] Judith Giton (died 1711), who escaped from her native France after King Louis XIV in 1685 revoked the Edict of Nantes that had given Huguenots free exercise of their religion and civil equality, graphically described years of back-breaking labor in a letter to her brother in Germany:

> Our eldest brother died of a fever, eighteen months after coming here, being unaccustomed to the hard work we were subjected to. We ourselves have been exposed, since leaving France, to all kinds of afflictions, in the forms of sickness, pestilence, famine, poverty, and the roughest labor. I have been for six months at a time in this country without tasting bread, laboring meanwhile like a slave in tilling the ground. Indeed, I have spent three or four years without knowing what it was to eat bread whenever I wanted it. God has been very good to us in enabling us to bear up under trials of every kind.[13]

After her first husband died, she married Huguenot Pierre Manigault. The money they made from keeping lodgers and operating a distillery and cooperage became the foundation of the great estate that their son Gabriel Manigault (1704-1781) later built.

Although Judith Giton Manigault never achieved public recognition, several notable European women, for example, Henrietta Johnston, Elizabeth Timothy, and Eliza Lucas Pinckney, pioneered careers that made them "firsts" in their fields in British North America.

Henrietta de Beaulieu (born c. 1674 in France or England; died 9 March 1729 in Charleston) was of French Huguenot descent. After her first husband, Robert Dering, died, she married Gideon Johnston in 1705, and emigrated with him from Ireland, arriving in Charleston in the spring of 1708. In straitened financial circumstances as Rector of St. Philip's Church, he acknowledged that "'were it not for the Assistance my wife gives me by drawing of Pictures (which can last but a little time in a place so ill peopled) I shou'd not have been able to live.'" Trained probably by a London area miniaturist, Henrietta Johnston

[11] Nancy Woloch, Editor, *Early American Women: A Documentary History, 1600-1900* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1992), p. 76.

[12] Woloch, ed., *Early American Women*, p. 32.

[13] Charles Washington Baird, *History of the Huguenot Immigration to America*, vol. II (New York, 1885; reprinted by Regional Publishing Company, Baltimore, 1966), pp. 183, 112-114, 182-183. After arriving in South Carolina in 1686, Judith Giton had married Noe Royer, another Huguenot refugee.

is said to have been the first woman professional artist in the colonies and the first pastel artist in America. More than forty existing portraits, dating from 1704 to 1729, are attributed to her crayon, among them the portraits of Mary DuBose (Mrs. Samuel Wragg) and her sisters, Judith (Mrs. Joseph Wragg) and Ann (Mrs. Job Rothmahler). These portraits are notable for their "depiction of the lovely liquid eyes and delicate skin tones." After almost three centuries, she had "her first shows" in 1991-1992 at the Museum of Early Southern Decorative Arts, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, and at the Gibbes Museum of Art in Charleston.[14]

In 1733 Elizabeth and her husband Lewis Timothy, a French Huguenot, came to Charleston, where Lewis, in partnership with Benjamin Franklin, began publishing the *South-Carolina Gazette*. Franklin, who provided one-third of the expenses, in exchange for one-third of the profits, continued this arrangement with Elizabeth after Timothy died in 1738. In his *Autobiography*, Franklin complimented her business skills:

> being born and bred in Holland, where . . . the knowledge of accounts makes a part of female education, she not only sent me as clear a state as she could find of the transactions past, but continued to account with the greatest regularity and exactness every quarter afterwards, and managed the business with such success, that she not only brought up reputably a family of children, but . . . was able to purchase of me the printing-house, and establish her son in it.

Although continuing to use her husband's name as printer, Elizabeth Timothy (died 1757) may be considered, nevertheless, "the first American woman to publish a newspaper."[15]

By the eighteenth century, as the English colonies developed a social hierarchy resembling the mother country's, upper-class women like Eliza Lucas Pinckney (1722-1793) "were on the cutting edge of social change," said historian Nancy Woloch.[16] Education allowed them to serve successfully "as companions to their husbands and as domestic managers, child-rearers, and transmitters of values." Emerging as "Republican Mothers" during the revolutionary and early national periods, they shaped the "modern 'middle-class'

[14] "Henrietta Johnston 'Who greatly helped . . . by drawing pictures'": The Museum of Early Southern Decorative Arts, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, October 12-December 8, 1991. The Gibbes Museum of Art, Charleston, South Carolina, December 13, 1991-February 2, 1992, Exhibit catalog, *The Museum of Early Southern Decorative Arts*, ed. by Forsyth Alexander; photography by Bradford L. Rauschenberg and Wesley Stewart (Winston-Salem: Old Salem, Inc., 1991), pp. 10-11, 15, 1-16. See also Anna Wells Rutledge, *Artists in the Life of Charleston: Through Colony and State From Restoration to Reconstruction*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 39, #2 (Philadelphia, 1949); Reprint Edition (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1980).

[15] "Timothy, Elizabeth" and "Timothy, Ann," by Richard Maxwell Brown, in *Notable American Women 1607-1950: A Biographical Dictionary*, edited by Edward T. James, Janet Wilson James, Paul S. Boyer, Volume III, P-Z, prepared under the Auspices of Radcliffe College (Cambridge MA.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971), pp. 466, 465. Benjamin Franklin, *The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin*, with a Postscript by Richard Morris (New York: Pocket Books, Inc., 1954), pp. 119-120.

[16] Woloch, ed., *Early American Women*, p. 35.

roles of the nineteenth century."[17] The ideal patriotic mother in the young republic would serve as first teacher to her children, training them for their appropriate adult roles: her sons for virtuous citizenship and her daughters for marriage and motherhood.

At seventeen years of age, Eliza Lucas, the eldest child, became the full-time manager of her father's three South Carolina plantations near Charleston, while Colonel George Lucas served as England's royal governor of Antigua. Educated in England, she became a pioneer agronomist and lady of letters. Her experiments with indigo succeeded in producing the highly esteemed blue dye that became second to rice as an export from the colony. An independent and self-confident young woman, she deftly turned down suitors selected by her father, preferring to remain single a few more years. In regard to "Mr. L," she wrote, "pay my thanks to the old Gentleman for his Generosity and favourable sentiments of me and let him know my thoughts on the affair . . . the riches of Peru and Chili if he had them put together could not purchase a sufficient Esteem for him to make him my husband."[18] In May 1744, she married widower Charles Pinckney, a lawyer, a planter, and later colonial agent to England.

In her birthday resolutions during the 1750s, she set herself the task of excelling at each of woman's varied roles: "daughter, wife, mother, sister, mistress, friend, and 'lover of all mankind.'" She also resolved to be "a good Mistress to my Servants [slaves], to treat them with humanity and good nature; to give them sufficient and comfortable clothing and Provisions, and all things necessary for them."[19]

After her husband died in 1758, she resumed management of the family plantations and experimented with raising silk worms. Gowns made from her silk were loomed and dyed in England for her daughter. Together with her two sons, Charles Cotesworth and Thomas Pinckney, and daughter Harriott Pinckney Horry, she founded one of South Carolina's most successful families. Both her sons served in the Patriot Army and had distinguished political careers. At Hampton Plantation, which Harriott capably managed after her own husband's death, Eliza Lucas Pinckney welcomed George Washington. He later served as pallbearer at her funeral in Philadelphia, where she had gone to seek medical treatment for cancer.[20]

These women immigrants--Judith Giton Manigault, Henrietta Johnston, Elizabeth Timothy, and Eliza Lucas Pinckney--took advantage of situations and challenged gender stereotypes and certain social conventions about women's proper roles. Closely following English equity law, Colonial South Carolina allowed white women financial independence within marriage, including the right to manage their own property in a separate estate and even to operate businesses as if they were single women (feme sole traders). But women had

[17] Woloch, ed., *Early American Women*, pp. 35, 48.

[18] Eliza Lucas to Colonel Lucas, *The Letterbook of Eliza Lucas Pinckney*, 1739-1762, ed. Elise Pinckney, with Marvin R. Zahniser (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1972), pp. 5-6.

[19] Woloch, ed., *Early American Women*, pp. 48, 50.

[20] Nancy Woloch, Chapter 3 "Eliza Pinckney and Republican Motherhood," *Women and the American Experience* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984), pp. 51-64.

to wait until the twentieth century to gain the civil and political rights enjoyed by white men, among them the right to vote and to serve on juries.[21]

Class and race have continued to separate and differentiate women from the seventeenth to the twentieth century. While all women may have been legally disadvantaged compared to men, white women in general enjoyed higher status and better socio-economic conditions than did Native American or African American women.[22]

Though "the African American presence in South Carolina dates back to at least 466 years ago, 34 years after Columbus landed in the New World," stated Dr. Thavolia Glymph of the USC History Department, their "systematic exploitation" began with the English settlement in 1670. By 1708 South Carolina had become the only North American colony in which a majority of the population were slaves. Even as their labor and reproductive value were exploited, slave women resisted and endured. With emancipation, they began to educate themselves and their children. African American women "labored as domestic servants, sharecroppers, and even, occasionally, businesswomen. They founded churches and colleges, hospitals and orphanages, organized South Carolina Federation of Colored Women's Clubs and formed chapters of the National Council of Negro Women led by the indefatigable Mary McLeod Bethune." Through the efforts of many black women, including the outstanding work of civil rights activists Septima Poinsette Clark and Modjeska Simkins, the cause of racial justice and equality has been significantly advanced in South Carolina.[23]

The final panelist, Dr. Miriam Freeman of the USC College of Social Work, linked the legacies of the encounter of 1492--racism and sexism--with the status of contemporary women in South Carolina. Comprising 52% of the population, women are racially grouped as follows: 68% are white, 30.8% are African American, less than one percent (.79%) are of Hispanic origin, while Native Americans are just a fraction (.22%). In 1990, 59% of South Carolina women were employed, an increase of about 20% since 1960; and 65% of working mothers, the second highest percentage in the United States, have children under six years of age. But "women make less money and are poorer than men" and exercise far less political power, prestige, and influence, partly as a consequence of "the European patriarchal

[21] Marylynn Salmon, *Women and the Law of Property in Early America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986); and Mary Roberts Parramore, "'For Her Sole and Separate Use': Feme Sole Trader Status in Early South Carolina," M.A. thesis, University of South Carolina, 1991. Not until the twentieth century could wives obtain an absolute divorce with the right to remarriage, although the Constitution of 1868, which was ratified during Radical Reconstruction, had legalized absolute divorce in South Carolina from 1868 to 1878. In 1872, a comprehensive divorce bill defining grounds, alimony, and court jurisdiction was enacted. However, following the political victory of the Redeemers in 1877, absolute divorce was again banned in South Carolina until the enactment of a new law in 1948.

[22] Although many white women accepted the economic and social status that slave-owning gave them, there were notable exceptions who tried either to lessen its harshness or to undermine it. For example, Sarah (1792-1873) and Angelina Grimke (1805-1879), daughters of a prominent, wealthy Charleston family of Huguenot ancestry, left South Carolina because of their opposition to slavery and became abolitionists and women's rights advocates in the North. See "Grimke, Sarah Moore and Angelina Emily Grimke," by Betty L. Fladeland in *Notable American Women 1607-1950: A Biographical Dictionary*. Edited by Edward T. James, Janet Wilson James, Paul S. Boyer, Volume II, G-O. Prepared under the Auspices of Radcliffe College (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971), pp. 97-99; Gerda Lerner, *The Grimke Sisters from South Carolina: Pioneers for Woman's Rights and Abolition* (New York: Schocken, 1971); and Katharine Du Pre Lumpkin, *The Emancipation of Angelina Grimke*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1974.

[23] Thavolia Glymph, "African-American Women in South Carolina Through Time." See also Jacqueline Jones, *Labor of Love, Labor of Sorrow: Black Women, Work, and the Family from Slavery to the Present* (New York, 1985); and Peter H. Wood, *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion* (New York, 1974).

tradition of white male dominance" that "continues to shape the lives of South Carolinians today."[24]

For example, positions of economic leadership remain closed to women. In the private sphere, Freeman found virtually total male dominance. The Palmetto Business Forum, reputedly "the body with the most political and economic clout in this state, has all male membership" representing banks, businesses, newspapers, and utilities.[25] Across the income spectrum, substantial differentials persist between men and women and between whites and African Americans. In 1980 the highest paid workers were white males, followed by black males, who were followed by white females; black females were fourth. Such gender- and race-based income disparities result in a high percentage of female-headed families living in poverty: "One in every 2 families maintained by an African American single female . . . compared to 30% of all African American families, 20% of families headed by white women and 7% of all white families." During the past decade, the wages women earned rose slightly from about 64 cents to about 70 cents for every dollar that a man earned.[26]

Women's limited economic power translates into limited political influence. Not suprisingly, 86% of the state legislators are men. There are only two women in the Senate and 21 in the House; of the latter, six are African Americans. Only one woman, Nancy Stevenson, has served as Lieutenant Governor; there is currently only one woman elected for a full term in her own right in the United States House of Representatives, Democrat Elizabeth Patterson of the Fourth Congressional District. Jean H. Toal is the only woman on the South Carolina Supreme Court.

After citing statistics from the 1980 and 1990 Federal Censuses and from South Carolina state agency reports that showed the negative factors impeding women's progress, Freeman concluded that change is possible since women now earn 56.8% of the higher education degrees and are a majority of the registered voters.[27] Expanding on the issues raised by the panel discussion, three nationally recognized scholars contributed new insights and information in their subsequent presentations at USC and the YWCA. [28] In her lecture on "Late 19th and early 20th Century African American Women" (February 4, 1992), Dr. Deborah White of Rutgers University discussed the work of the National Association of Colored Women, the first national black organization, and the unique position of African American women, whom she compared to "tangerines." Carrying a double burden caused

[24] Miriam L. Freeman, "The Status of Contemporary Women in South Carolina." See also South Carolina Employment Security Commission, *South Carolina Labor Market Review 1991* (Columbia, SC, 1991) and *Working Women of Today and Tomorrow* (Columbia, SC, 1991).

[25] Freeman, "The Status of Contemporary Women in South Carolina." See also South Carolina Commission on Women, *Armed and Dangerous: A Basic Workbook for Women Who Want to Influence Public Policy* (Columbia, SC, 1989).

[26] Freeman, "The Current Status of Women in South Carolina." South Carolina State Data Center, *Profile of South Carolina Females* (Columbia: Division of Research and Statistical Services, State Budget and Control Board, 1986).

[27] Freeman, "The Current Status of Women in South Carolina"; South Carolina Commission on Women, *Just the Facts, Ma'm: Information About the Status of Women in the United States and South Carolina* (Columbia, undated).

[28] For a summary of the panel presentations and the lectures by the visiting scholars-- Dr. Deborah White, Dr. Jane Landers, and Dr. Theda Perdue, see "Women in South Carolina Through Time: Quincentennial Questions," in "The State of Women's Studies at Carolina, News from Women's Studies at The University of South Carolina" (Spring 1992): 3-4, 8.

by the intersection of racism and sexism, African American women "had to devise programs that served women and blacks at the same time," whether it was voting rights or equal employment opportunities.[29]

Then Dr. Jane Landers of the University of Florida pointed out in "Native American and African Women under Spanish Rule" (February 25, 1992) that African American and Native American slaves who escaped to Florida and who declared a desire to convert to Catholicism were protected by Spanish law from the Carolina planters who wanted them returned. Spanish law also accorded women certain conjugal and property rights.[30] Finally, speaking "On Writing a History of Native American Women" (March 3, 1992), Dr. Theda Perdue of the University of Kentucky examined how and why the "old world perceptions" that Native American men were lazy and the women promiscuous differed from "new world realities." Often practicing serial monogamy, men and women exercised authority within their respective spheres. Native American society was not a patriarchy; indeed, inheritance was matrilineal.[31]

Thus, for Native American women, as for African American women, race and class may have been the crucial determinants. Since white middle and upper class women were neither racially nor economically disadvantaged, gender roles and restrictions may have been more decisive in shaping their lives. By examining the experiences of Native American, European, and African American women, both academic and community audiences can gain a greater understanding of the ways in which race, class, and gender intersect in American history.

To communicate their knowledge to a broad public audience, the six USC faculty members and the three visiting scholars also developed Quintminutes for South Carolina Educational Television that illustrated their respective talks. Finally, all nine women were interviewed on their research for a documentary filmed by SCETV that should be available to teachers through Instructional Television by the fall of 1992.

[29] Deborah White, "Late 19th and early 20th Century African American Women." See also White, *Ar'n't I A Woman, Female Slaves in the Plantation South* (New York, 1985); and Paula Giddings, *When and Where I Enter. The Impact of Black Women on Race and Sex in America* (New York, 1984).

[30] Dr. Jane Landers, "Native and African American Women under Spanish Rule."

[31] Dr. Theda Perdue, "On Writing a History of Native American Women." See also Perdue, "Native American Women: Old World Perceptions, New World Realities," unpublished paper (1991); Robert F. Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present* (New York, 1978); and Deborah Welch, "American Indian Women: Reaching Beyond the Myth," in *New Directions in American Indian History*, ed. Colin G. Calloway (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988).

THE HISTORY OF MOUNT PLEASANT PROJECT: INVOLVING STUDENTS IN COMMUNITY HISTORY

Amy Thompson McCandless
College of Charleston

In the fall of 1990 the Town of Mount Pleasant decided to commission a new history of the community. A history of the town had been published in 1960 by Petrona Royall McIver, a descendant of one of the founding fathers of the East Cooper village, but it focused primarily on the white population and ignored the substantial contributions of African-Americans to the development of the region. Because the McIver story ended in the early fifties, there was no consideration of the tremendous social, economic, and political changes which have occurred in Mount Pleasant in the last few decades.

As a historian at the College of Charleston and a resident of Mount Pleasant, I was asked to serve on the Historic Commission which was to write the new history. The Commission was determined to gather information which would include all elements of the community--blacks and whites, rich and poor, men and women. Because the history would involve a considerable amount of research and the use of many "non-traditional" materials and techniques, it seemed a perfect way to introduce the History of South Carolina class which I team-teach with colleague Wayne Jordan at the College of Charleston to historical theory and methodology. The Commission was quite pleased to have so many young people participating in the project, and our students were quite excited about the opportunity to do "real" history.

The Commission decided that its first priority would be to record the reminiscences of some of the town's oldest residents. College of Charleston students would conduct the interviews, type transcripts of the tapes, and prepare summary cards describing the highlights of the interview. The tapes and transcripts would be deposited in the new Mount Pleasant library and at the Afro-American Research Center (Avery) at the College of Charleston where they could be used both by the Commission and by independent historians.

The oral history interviews subsequently became the major project for our students in Maymester 1991. The Mount Pleasant project was integrated into class assignments in a number of ways. In preparing for, carrying out, and evaluating the individual interviews, students discussed the various methodological and ideological problems historians face when practicing their profession. The Town of Mount Pleasant was also used as a case study to illustrate various themes in South Carolina history.

We first focused on the writing of local history. Students examined a number of local histories from the state housed in the Special Collections at the Robert Scott Small Library on campus, in the South Carolina Room at the Charleston County Library, and in the printed collections of the Charleston Library Society and the South Carolina Historical Society. They were asked to note what individuals and topics were included in these various histories and what were not.[1] Students quickly discovered that most local histories highlighted the political and economic elite of each era and contained little about the lives of the common people. Discussion of these works led students to raise a number of questions about the writing of history: What/Who is considered important? How does the availability of evidence shape the historian's perspective? How does the author's bias affect the inclusion and evaluation of material?

At the end of their critique of existing publications, we asked students to describe the "ideal" contents of a local history book. Although the students agreed that one could not leave out a discussion of the community's leaders and institutions, they also thought that a thorough history should cover the lives of "just plain folk" as well. When asked which of the histories they examined most closely approached their ideal, the students voted overwhelmingly for George Rogers' history of Georgetown.

We also discussed some of the advantages and disadvantages of writing about a local community enumerated by Carol Kammen in her book *On Doing Local History*. The advantages of a local topic were obvious to most of our students: the material was nearby, names and places were familiar, issues were relevant, and interest was high. The disadvantages were not as apparent. One of the greatest problems of doing local history, Kammen had noted, was that most people do not want themselves or their institutions treated critically. She wrote: "If most communities had to select either the truth or a

[1] Some the local histories examined include: George C. Rogers, Jr., The History of Georgetown County, South Carolina (Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 1970); Zan Heyward, *Things I Remember* (Columbia: The State Record Company, 1964); Louis B. Wright, *Barefoot in Arcadia: Memories of a More Innocent Era* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1974); Petrona Royall McIver, *History of Mount Pleasant* (Mount Pleasant: Ashley Printing and Publishing Co., 1960); Ben Robertson, *Red Hills and Cotton: An Upcountry Memory* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1960); *Saluda County in Scene and Story* (N.p.: The Saluda County Tricentennial Commission, 1970); Caroline S. Coleman and B.C. Givens, *History of Fountain Inn: Fountain Inn, South Carolina* (N.p., c. 1966); Mildred W. Goodlett, *The History of Travelers Rest* (N.p., 1966); Louis Cassels, *Coontail Lagoon: A Celebration of Life* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974); Celina McGregor Vaughan, *Pawley's . . . As It Was* (Columbia: N.p., 1969); Beulah Glover, *Narratives of Colleton County* (N.p., 1963); *Darlingtoniana: A History of People, Places and Events in Darlington County, South Carolina*, ed. by Eliza Cowan Ervin and Horace Fraser Rudisill (Columbia: The R.L. Bryan Company, 1964); Anne King Gregorie, *History of Sumter County, South Carolina* (Sumter: Library Board of Sumter County, 1954); Harry Worcester Smith, *Life and Sport in Aiken and Those Who Made It* (New York: The Derrydale Press, c. 1935).

flattering biography, they would take their histories on the positive side."[2] Negative comments could be particularly problematic if historians lived in the community they evaluated. They could find themselves without friends and without sources of information.[3]

Our own students soon discovered the validity of Kammen's statements. When an article in the Charleston *Evening Post* announcing the upcoming interviews characterized the earlier history by Petrona McIver as anecdotal and incomplete, many long-time Mount Pleasant residents who had known McIver were upset. They were particularly stung by town planner Don Embrey's comment that the commission wanted to write a "'more scholarly' book that would be more appropriate for town residents."[4]

Because the Historic Commission appeared to be criticizing "family," some people decided that they did not want to be interviewed, and they let town officials know in no uncertain terms that the McIver volume contained all that needed to be told. Commission members rushed to the telephone, soothing bruised egos and telling residents that Mr. Embrey had been misquoted. Although most individuals agreed to be interviewed despite the brouhaha over the McIver book, quite a number of participants lectured student interviewers on the excellence of the 1960 history. As the author's daughters, Sarah McIver Townsend and Julie McIver explained, "Mt. Pleasant does have a history and it is important. The lady who first wrote it [their mother] has been put upon by the committee. Our mother . . . used nothing but the plain facts, not just reminiscing in oral history."[5] Many of those interviewed made similar comments, and a number suggested that the commission simply reissue the McIver volume with a post-1960 sequel.

These complaints were limited to the white community, however. Most African-Americans seemed pleased that efforts were being made to tell of their roles in Mount Pleasant's history. In fact, an African-American minister, the Rev. Louis Johnson, informed students that he was writing his own history of the town so that people would know that there were more blacks in Mount Pleasant than the few servants described in the McIver book.[6]

The oral history project also provided an opportunity for students to learn how to construct a questionnaire. After examining a number of questionnaires which had been used by various faculty members in their own research projects (including a questionnaire I had devised for my own work on Southern college women), we discussed how best to elicit the information we wanted from the interviews. We talked about phrasing questions so that they would encourage detailed responses rather than one- or two-word answers.

A general knowledge of South Carolina history was crucial to the construction of the Mount Pleasant questionnaire. Because our oldest participants were in their eighties, the class decided to concentrate on the years since World War I. Students consulted the *Guide*

[2] Carol Kammen, Doing Local History: Reflections on What Local Historians Do, Why, and What It Means (Nashville, TN: The American Association for State and Local History, 1988), 133.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] Kim Wise, "Town to Write History," East Cooper Section, *News and Courier* (Charleston, SC), 23 May 1991.

[5] Sarah McIver Townsend and Julia McIver, interviewed by Beth Smith and Keeling Redding, 29 May 1991.

[6] Rev. Louis Johnson, interviewed by Neal Golden and Stephen Donald, 29 May 1991.

for the Teaching of South Carolina History which Walter Edgar produced for the SC Department of Education to familiarize themselves with individuals, ideas, and events which had not yet been covered in class lectures.[7] Groups of students worked on various sections of the questionnaire, and the entire class reviewed the entire document before it was put on the word processor and distributed. [See Appendix I for a copy of the questionnaire.]

I pretested the questionnaire on a cooperative colleague who happened to be born in Mount Pleasant in 1923 and played parts of the tape to the class. Students were pleased to see that the interview soon took on a life of its own and that even two faculty members had a hard time following the "script." Because many of the prospective participants (and many of the students) had indicated that they were nervous about the upcoming interviews, we also discussed ways of putting everyone at ease. Serving coffee and doughnuts was one way we hoped would create an informal atmosphere; grouping rocking chairs at various windows facing the harbor in historic Alhambra Hall was another. So that participants would not be surprised by any of the questions, a copy of the questionnaire was mailed to them a week before the interview, and they were told that they could cross out questions they did not wish to answer. Students took home copies of the questionnaire as well and "practiced" on their friends and family.

The interviews were held on May 28th and 29th between 9:00 a.m. and noon. The Historic Commission contacted the individuals to be interviewed, obtained tapes and recorders for the students, reserved Alhambra Hall in Mount Pleasant for the interviews, arranged transportation to and from the hall, and provided refreshments for the participants. Interview times were scheduled to coincide with Maymester class hours. Since only forty-some individuals had signed up to be interviewed and there were eighty-six students in the class, students worked in teams of two. Although several students requested to interview individuals they knew, most students were matched with participants according to time preferences.

All in all, the interviews were very successful. Although I was worried about the possibility of "no-shows"--both among students and participants--only one participant called in sick, and all the students found their way across the Cooper River. There were some "glitches." The air-conditioning in Alhambra Hall broke down early on the first morning. The ceiling fans drew in the breezes from the harbor, but the temperature on the second floor quickly rose into the nineties. There was also a rather embarrassing moment when an older white woman did not want to participate because her interviewers were "colored." The students were told that she was "sick," and they were matched with a more congenial gentleman.

After the sessions were over, students compared their findings with one another. Using transcripts of the tapes as sources, we constructed a demographic profile of the participants and listed some of our most interesting discoveries. [See Appendix II] Students quickly became aware of contradictions in the statements of respondents. We asked them to try to

[7] Walter B. Edgar, *A Guide for the Teaching of South Carolina History and Its Relationship with United States History* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Education, 1989).

account for these differences--was it a case of poor memory or different perceptions? How might they find out what "really" happened?

The demographic profile of the participants revealed a number of areas not covered by the interviews. The forty-eight individuals interviewed ranged in age from 45 to 88. Twenty-seven of the forty-eight or 56.3 percent of those participating in the project were female; ten of the forty-eight, or 20.8 percent, were African-American. The average age of the participants was 73.3 years; the average length of residence in Mount Pleasant 63.2 years. Only seven respondents had not been born in the area; only three had not been born in South Carolina. Twenty-two, or 45.8 percent, had lived in the area their entire lives.

Most respondents were very well educated. Thirty-two, or 66.7 percent, indicated at least some post-high school education. Seventy percent of the African-Americans interviewed possessed a baccalaureate, professional, or graduate degree. Only one person in the entire group had not attended high school.

When these results were compared with demographic materials on Mount Pleasant in the *South Carolina Statistical Abstract*, students concluded that the project participants did not represent a cross section of Mount Pleasant residents. More input was needed from African-Americans, from young people, from farm laborers and domestic workers, and from the less educated in the community.

A number of students remarked that the Historic Commission needed to define the area to be encompassed by the history. The boundaries of the "old village" provided by most respondents--"from Shem Creek to the Cove; up to what is now Simmons Street, then Boundary Street, to Rifle Range Road, now McCants; from Pitt Street to Middle Street"[8]--were quite different from the boundaries of the town of Mount Pleasant today. By advertising the project as a History of Mount Pleasant, the Commission inadvertently may have discouraged the participation of individuals who lived in areas which were not incorporated into the town until recently.

Students noted that most respondents focused on people, places, and events in their youth, and for the "average" respondent, born in 1914, this meant the 1920s and 1930s. For more information about the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, the Commission needed to interview more "middle-aged" residents. The class also thought it might be a good idea to have special group sessions focusing on particular topics such as civil rights activities, economic issues, or educational developments. A number of the transcripts from this first session revealed that many of those being interviewed were very curious about what their "neighbors" were saying. Most of these individuals would probably participate in a group session where they could comment and expand upon others' statements.

The students suggested using a camrecorder to videotape such round table discussions. Equipment could be set up beforehand so as not to appear obtrusive. Although some students worried that participants would be intimidated by the presence of a camera, most argued that people would forget about the camera when everyone began talking.

[8] Thomas Hayes, interviewed by Chris Linder and Allyson Sanders, 29 May 1991.

Students were also impressed by the many mementos of their lives which participants brought to the interviews. They thought that future classes could use topical sessions to collect pictorial and written sources dealing with a particular aspect of the town's history. Individuals could be asked to bring to the session any artifacts, photographs, newspaper clippings, papers, etc., they had on the subject, and relevant materials could be photocopied or photographed.

The class discussions following the interviews revealed that the students had benefited tremendously from their involvement in the Mount Pleasant oral history interviews. Many respondents answered the thank-you notes their interviewers had written them, and many students were interested in following further developments in the lives of "their person."

From my perspective as a professor, there were problems integrating a community history project into classroom activities. Coordinating the interviews was tremendously time consuming even though members of the Historic Commission helped with phone calls. I was terrified that a student would decide to drop the class the day of his/her interview! Grading students for their work on the project was also problematic. Because we did not want students to panic if their informant refused to talk (and two did), we agreed to give everyone who conducted an interview, transcribed the tape, and prepared a summary card an "A" for the assignment. The finished products were not all equal, however. Some students were better than others at conducting interviews; some participants were better than others at giving them. Even though the questionnaire was available on a computer disk, typing the transcript was difficult for many students, especially those who were unfamiliar with East Cooper names and pronunciations.

Having eighty-six "research assistants" obviously helped us gather a lot of information in a short period of time, but the students' work needed to be checked for omissions and errors. Reading forty-eight transcripts in one week was not an easy task. Sometimes student spellings were so original that the tape had to be played to find out the proper word. Nonetheless, the effort was worth it.

Our students gained considerable historical insight from their work in community history. Participating in the oral history project helped them understand why historians need to evaluate their evidence critically and to use several sources to corroborate individual statements. On a more personal note, it introduced them to those individuals who "created" modern Mount Pleasant: they learned of their joys and sorrows, their failures and their triumphs, their faults and their virtues. Stories of outdoor privies and iceboxes, of hard work and low wages, of folk remedies and home treatments also made them more aware--and hopefully more appreciative--of their own abundance.

If the purpose of education is indeed to help us "know ourselves," then the study of the past should begin at home. The examination of particular economic, social, and political developments in Mount Pleasant in the years since 1914 made our College of Charleston students far more aware of general sources and themes in South Carolina history.

Appendix I: Questionnaire

HISTORY OF MOUNT PLEASANT QUESTIONNAIRE 5/17/91

****

The following personal information is optional, but it will help us to draw a demographic profile of each informant.

Name_____

Date of Birth_____ Birthplace_____

Current Address_____ Telephone_____

_____

How many years have you lived in Mount Pleasant?_____

Marital Status (circle one): single married separated
divorced widowed

Number of Children_____ Ages of Living Children_____

Ethnic Background: African-American_____
European-American_____
Asian-American_____
Other_____

Educational Background: Elementary school_____
High School_____ Diploma?_____
College_____ Degree?_____
Professional/Graduate School_____

Occupation_____ Are you retired?_____

****

Childhood

1. What are your earliest memories of Mt. Pleasant?

2. Describe your childhood home. Did it have electricity? Indoor plumbing?

3. How large was your family? Did anyone besides your parents and siblings live with you?

4. How did your parents make a living? Would you describe your family as rich, comfortable, struggling, poor?

5. What grammar/high school did you attend?
6. How far was each school from your home? How did you get there?

7. What are your fondest/worst memories of school?

8. How old were you when you got your first job outside the home? What sort of work did you do? Do you remember your salary?

Everyday Life

9. What was courting/dating like in your youth?

10. What did people do for recreation?

11. What role did religion play in your early life?

12. Did your family belong to a church? If yes, which one?

13. What sort of church activities did you participate in?

14. How would you compare religious practices today with those in your youth?

15. Where did your family do their shopping?

16. Were you born in a hospital or at home? Did a doctor, a midwife, or family member deliver you?

17. Did your family visit a doctor regularly? If so, who?

18. What sort of illnesses would have been treated at home? How would they have been treated?

19. Were doctors' offices and hospitals segregated during your youth? If yes, how do you think this affected health care?

20. What diseases were most common when you were growing up? Which took the most lives?

21. What ceremonies and customs were associated with death and dying?

Political

22. Are you registered to vote? If yes, how old were you when you first registered?

23. What did you need to qualify to vote when you were young? Was there a poll tax? A literacy test?

24. Do you consider yourself a Republican, Democrat, or Independent?

25. What were political campaigns like in your youth?

26. Did you ever go and listen to a candidate for office speak in Mount Pleasant? If yes, describe what you saw and heard.

27. What do you see as the greatest changes in politics in Mount Pleasant since your youth?

The Community

28. How large was the town of Mount Pleasant when you were growing up? What were the borders of the town then?

29. What sort of public services were there? (Fire? Police? Garbage/trash? Mail Delivery?)

30. When did most homes in the town get electricity and indoor plumbing?

31. How did homes without electricity keep food fresh?

32. Did many homes in the town have outhouses?

33. What sort of transportation did people use to get from place to place?

34. Do you remember the trolley? If yes, describe the people who rode it most often and the routes they took.

35. Do you remember the ferry? If yes, describe the people who rode it most often and the routes they took.

36. Do you remember when there was no/only one Cooper River Bridge? What did a journey to Charleston entail in those days?

37. How many families had personal automobiles when you were growing up? When did cars replace public transportation in popularity in the town?

Historical Events

38. What holidays were celebrated in your youth? (Memorial Day? Emancipation Day? Robert E. Lee's birthday? Labor Day? Fourth of July? Christmas? Easter? Others?)

39. How were holidays celebrated? (Family dinners? Parades? Picnics? Fairs?) Who organized such celebrations?

40. Do you remember World War I? (If not, skip to #42)

41. What impact did World War I have on the people and town?

42. Do you remember Prohibition? (If not, skip to #45)

43. Were there any "blind tigers" or illegal liquor dealers in Mount Pleasant? Were there any local bootleggers?

44. How much liquor do you think was consumed in Mount Pleasant during Prohibition?

45. Do you remember the Depression? (If not, skip to #48)

46. How did the Wall Street Crash affect employment/business in Mount Pleasant?

47. Were there any New Deal (WPA, CCC) projects in the area?

48. Do you remember World War II? (If not, skip to #53)

49. Were you or any member of your family in the service? If yes, what branch? Where were you/they stationed?

50. What were your/their impressions of life outside Mount Pleasant?

51. Did area military installations have much impact on life in Mount Pleasant? If yes, explain.

52. What changes did World War II bring to the town of Mount Pleasant?

53. Do you remember the Civil Rights' protests of the 1950s and 1960s? (If not, skip to #61)

54. Were you involved in any way in the Civil Rights' Movement? If yes, describe your activities.

55. How and when were public accommodations and services (lunch rooms, hotels, buses, beaches) desegregated?

56. How and when were schools in Mount Pleasant integrated?

57. What role did the Mount Pleasant churches play in the Civil Rights' Movement?

58. Who were the most prominent Civil Rights' leaders in Mount Pleasant?

59. Did integration efforts result in any violence or arrests in the town?

60. How would you describe racial relations in Mount Pleasant?

61. Do you remember the Vietnam War? If not, skip to #64)

62. Were you or any member of your family in the military in Vietnam? If yes, how did this experience affect you/them?

63. Were there any protests against the war in Vietnam in the town?

64. Did a separate "youth culture" develop in Mount Pleasant in the sixties? If yes, would you consider these youth "hippies"?

65. Was there an increase in drug or alcohol use in the sixties and seventies?

66. What do you see as the most significant economic changes which have occurred in Mount Pleasant since your youth?

67. How do you explain the rapid expansion of the town since 1970?

68. What impact do you think air-conditioning has had on people's lives in the town?

South Carolina Historical Association

69. If you could choose one thing you would like future generations to know about Mt. Pleasant in your youth, what would it be?

Thank you for your time and assistance. You have contributed significantly to our knowledge of Mount Pleasant's past!

Please feel free to contact the Historical Commission if you wish to add some information to your interview or to bring others to be interviewed.

Appendix II: Interview Summary

The Town of Mount Pleasant was very much a rural village between the world wars. Most homes had electric lighting, but many did not have indoor plumbing. Outhouses were ubiquitous. The Rev. Moultrie Moore remembered that James Frampton had been bitten by a spider in an outhouse and almost died. "There was a real fear," Moore thought, "of going to the outhouse and getting stung."[9]

Food was purchased frequently and kept cold in an ice box. A number of respondents mentioned the "ice man," Hodges, coming round with 25 or 50 pound blocks of ice. Children would follow his cart, hoping for some "shavings" to keep cool--an early twentieth-century version of the snow cone!

There were few public services. Jervey Royall noted that "garbage collection consisted of a one-legged black man and a mule and a cart"; Herman Wacker also described trash being "picked up by horse and buggy and taken to a dump where the Trawler is now located."[10] Many residents simply burned trash in their back yards.

Fire was a problem. A number of individuals remembered the fire which destroyed the black orphanage as well as several nearby houses. There were no fire hydrants, so hoses had to be run to the channel to get water. Citizens often resorted to a "bucket brigade" to put out fires.[11]

Roads were unpaved, and cars were a luxury. Even after the "old bridge" was opened in 1929, most people still took the ferry to Charleston. They rode the trolley to Sullivan's Island and the Isle of Palms. In fact, streets were called stations, and markers on telephone poles indicated the trolley stops. Even a trip to McClellanville was quite arduous. Georgetown Highway was "paved" with oyster shells for about three miles out of the town, but for the rest of the way north the road was sand.

Few people lived lavishly. Most young men and many young women had part-time jobs by the time they were in high school. Margurite Johnson remembered that she was paid $1.00 a week for washing dishes and clothes and cooking rice for Mrs. Patjens. She then gave all her money to her mother.[12]

The Reverend Moultrie Moore recalled that when he first went into the ministry his salary was so low that after he paid for his travel expenses, car payments, and rent, he only had about $5 left to feed himself for the month. He subsequently found it necessary to visit his parishioners at mealtimes and pray they would invite him to dinner.[13]

Since there were no hospitals in Mount Pleasant, medical problems were handled in the doctor's office or at home. Folk remedies were often employed to treat common illnesses. Ira Brown remembered that if you came down with mumps "they tied cloth around your

[9] Rev. Moultrie Moore, interviewed by Wanda Ray and Janet Rose, 29 May 1991.

[10] Jervey Royall, interviewed by Malissa Coker and Barbara Ellis, 29 May 1991; Herman Wacker, interviewed by Sandra Millican and Kirk Bonnoitt, 29 May 1991.

[11] See interviews of Francis Coleman and Bessie Erckmann, 29 May 1991.

[12] Margurite Johnson, interviewed by Dean Mullinax and Heidi Tanner, 29 May 1991.

[13] Rev. Moultrie Moore, interviewed by Wanda Ray and Janet Rose, 29 May 1991.

neck with a piece of fatback under the neck. A weed from the beach that was called 'Life Everlasting' was boiled and used for colds."[14] Children were often dosed with castor oil and sometimes even calomel "whether we needed it or not."[15] Margurite Johnson described a fever remedy which involved pouring vinegar on a big leaf from the "fever bush." The mixture was spread all over the body of the ill person. But Mrs. Johnson noted that "If this didn't work, you had better call the doctor."[16] Poultices of various sorts seemed to be popular for treating colds. Several respondents remembered taking kerosene mixed with sugar to clear up their chest congestion.

Owing to monetary necessity and individual preference most babies were born at home. Black babies tended to be delivered by midwives and white babies by doctors. Mothers were encouraged to stay in bed for two weeks after the delivery. James Frampton was delivered by his own father, who, he proudly noted, "never lost a mother. He lost babies, but never a mother." Fees were adjusted according to the wherewithal of the patient: "Sometimes you'd get ten dollars . . . sometimes you'd get a cabbage."[17]

Despite the fact that few people had much money, life was "rich." Children spent their days swimming at the front beach and fishing and crabbing from the wharfs. Teenagers got together at one another's houses, cranked the victrola and danced with their friends. Sunday School and Church picnics were popular outings for both blacks and whites.

Whites often took the trolley over Cove Inlet to Sullivan's Island and then over Breech Inlet to the Isle of Palms where a large pavilion had been constructed in 1899. Dances were held every Tuesday, Friday, and Saturday at the pavilion, and there were concerts on Sunday. Children and adults alike enjoyed the merry-go-round and ferris wheel.[18]

Numerous social activities took place in Alhambra Hall in the thirties and forties. The downstairs was the Mount Pleasant Yacht Club, the site of numerous dances and parties. Rooms were rented by naval groups for various occasions, and the building even housed a bowling alley at one point.[19]

Social activities were segregated. Blacks had their own beaches along the Cooper River. The Reverend Louis Johnson recalled going to Riverside Beach Park for many holidays. On the Fourth of July there were picnics and bands for entertainment. According to Emily Ladson, there was a "large pavilion, a boardwalk, bath house, concessions, a playground for children, and churches would go there for their picnics. Calloway and even Duke Ellington played there."[20]

Almost all respondents believed that racial relations in Mount Pleasant had been good. The small-town nature of the village meant that everyone knew everyone else, and people tended to make judgments based on individual merits, not on racial characteristics. White

[14] Ira Brown, interviewed by Brenda Taylor and Lynn Lewis, 29 December 1991.
[15] Thomas Hayes, interviewed by Chris Linder and Allyson Sanders, 29 May 1991.
[16] Margurite Johnson, interviewed by Dean Mullinax and Heidi Tanner, 28 May 1991.
[17] James Frampton, interviewed by Georgia Cannon and Alisha Strickland, 29 May 1991.
[18] Wilfred Tiencken, interviewed by Cynthia Young and Ellen Wolf, 29 May 1991.
[19] Nelva Benton, interviewed by Beverly Benton, 29 May 1991.
[20] Rev. Louis Johnson, interviewed by Neal Golden and Stephen Donald, and Emily Ladson, interviewed by Mark Fortsen, 29 May 1991.

doctors treated both white and black patients (although a number of people noted that whites "got to see the doctor before blacks"). James Frampton, whose father had been a doctor, noted that his father charged blacks less than whites and provided medicine free of charge: "Babies were named after him," he recalled. "He was so good to these people."[21]

One of the most interesting examples of racial harmony was the existence of a black policeman. Edmund Jenkins walked the beat in Mount Pleasant at a time when few communities in the nation, let alone in the South, had any blacks on their police forces. Black and white respondents alike spoke highly of him both as a person and as an officer.

Not surprisingly, events associated with the Civil War were celebrated differently by whites and blacks in the town. A favorite holidays for white school children was Confederate Memorial Day on May 10th. Children marched from school to the Confederate cemetery, placed flowers on the graves of the war dead, sang patriotic songs, heard inspirational speeches, and "then the rest of the day was free."[22]

Black children did not celebrate Confederate Memorial Day, but many of the African-Americans interviewed remembered travelling to Charleston for Emancipation Day celebrations. Most white respondents had never heard of Emancipation Day.

Black and white residents of the town attended separate schools in the first half of the twentieth century. Respondents of both races remember these institutions and their faculty and staff quite fondly. Schools such as Mount Pleasant Academy and Laing played a large role in the life of the community. White high schools were also segregated by sex. After completing elementary school in Mount Pleasant, white children took the ferry across the harbor to Charleston where girls attended Memminger and the boys Charleston High.

Public transportation was also segregated. Wilfred Tiencken recalled that there were separate areas in the ferry and trolley for blacks and whites. The Rev. Moultrie Moore described the black section of the ferry as a hole "down in the bottom of the boat."[23]
Politics in Mount Pleasant and indeed in the entire state were quite different before World War II. Individuals needed to pass a literacy test and to pay a poll tax of one dollar to vote, although women seemed to have been exempt from the tax. Fewer blacks were registered to vote than whites, but a number of respondents asserted that blacks did vote in Mount Pleasant before the Voting Rights Act of 1964. The political preferences of voters divided sharply along racial lines. All of the blacks interviewed claimed to be Democrats; most of the whites interviewed had switched their allegiance to the Republican Party in the 1970s or 1980s.

Many respondents had interesting Prohibition stories to tell about Mount Pleasant. Even those people who did not drink conceded that the town was not "dry." Both Henry Burn and the Rev. Moultrie Moore remember their fathers hiding bootleg whiskey down in the basement. Moore could look out of his window and watch the wheel barrels of whiskey being carted up the beach at night. A hearse was used to transport the illicit cargo to

[21] James Frampton, interviewed by Georgia Cannon and Alisha Strickland, 29 May 1991.

[22] Sarah S. Colwell, interviewed by Victor Salvo and Kit Pound, 29 May 1991.

[23] Wilfred Tiencken, interviewed by Cynthia Young and Ellen Wolf, and the Rev. Moultrie Moore, interviewed by Wanda Ray and Janet Rose, 29 May 1991.

Charleston--until the authorities noticed that there were too many funerals. Moore's favorite story involved a visit of the church convention to his house. When one of the clergymen noted that prohibition made it more difficult for people who drank to get liquor, Moore piped up "No problem for my father; he buried a whole case of it underneath the house last week."[24]

Most of the people interviewed also had vivid memories of the Depression. Bessie Erckmann remembered people digging ditches for the WPA for one dollar a day. Vernon Lewis participated in the WPA project of remodelling Alhambra Hall which had been moved to its present location from a spot on Hogg's Island (now Patriot's Point). The Reverend Louis Johnson noted that the sewage system in Mount Pleasant was also a New Deal project.[25]

Respondents had far fewer comments about the post-World-War-II years. Perhaps we need to phrase these questions differently or ask them of individuals born in the thirties, forties, and fifties.

[24] Henry Burn, interviewed by Wayne Jordan, and the Rev. Moultrie Moore, interviewed by Wanda Ray and Janet Rose, 29 May 1991.
[25] Bessie Erckmann, interviewed by Shea Dukes and Kelly Mahaney; Vernon Lewis, interviewed by Edward Marlowe and Lee Runyon; the Rev. Louis Johnson, interviewed by Neal Golden and Stephen Donald, 29 May 1991.

HURRICANE HUGO: AN ISLAND'S EXPERIENCE

Jamie W. Moore
Department of History, The Citadel

Dorothy P. Moore
Department of Business Administration, The Citadel

This study reports on the effects of the 1989 hurricane on the community of Sullivan's Island, South Carolina. Hugo was a Category IV hurricane registering winds up to 140 miles per hour in the eye wall when it made landfall at midnight on September 21, 1989. South Carolina's worst hurricane since 1872, the strongest storm to strike the United States since 1969, until 1992's Hurricane Andrew, it was responsible for the greatest property loss of any natural disaster in American history. The center of the eye passed directly over Sullivan's Island. Ground level wind speeds were estimated at 90 to 100 miles per hour with gusts to 125 miles per hour when Hugo struck land. A storm surge 13.5 feet above mean sea level submerged the island for a time.[1]

Because residents had heeded advance warnings, no lives were lost. This is common. Today's weather-related natural disasters tend to be more or less clean, meaning with few, if any, casualties. Only a fraction of one percent of the Sullivan's Island residents chose to wait out the storm.[2] Before the advent of modern protection and warning measures, high casualties were the norm. No one knows how many lives were lost in the 1900 Galveston hurricane; there is only a generally accepted figure of more than 6,000 deaths, but estimates range up to 8,000. Between 1900 and 1940, when the first federal flood control programs

[1]J. Brennan, "Meteorological Summary of Hurricane Hugo," *Journal of Coastal Research*, 8 (Spring, 1991), 1-12; N. Coch and M. Wolff, "Effects of Hurricane Hugo Storm Surge in Coastal South Carolina," *Journal of Coastal Research*, 8 (Spring, 1991), 201-226 & 207; C. Rubin and R. Popkin, "Disaster Recovery After Hurricane Hugo in South Carolina, "Working Paper #69, Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center, Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, Boulder. The National Hurricane Center rates hurricanes on the basis of wind speeds at an altitude of 1500 feet.

[2]E. Baker, "Evacuation Decision Making and Public Response in Hurricane Hugo in South Carolina," Quick Response Research Report No. 39 (Boulder: University of Colorado Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center, 1990), 8; Ellis L. Armstrong and Howard Rosen, *Effective Emergency Response, The Salt Lake Valley Floods of 1983, 1984, & 1985* (Chicago: Public Works Historical Society, 1986), 9-14, 38. Only one respondent to the survey admitted waiting out the storm on the island.

began to take effect, floods resulting in the loss of 100 or more lives averaged one every three years.[3]

The ability of people and communities to endure suffering and adjust to disaster is remarkable. In Great Britain in World War II, neither the productivity nor the morale of urban residents were shattered by the 1940-1941 blitz, and the social fabric in German and Japanese cities remained cohesive until the very end under much fiercer bombing. The analogy of bomb damage is not misplaced. The physical destruction visited by earthquakes and hurricanes is similar in many respects to damage caused by war. Said an Army engineer officer after viewing the destruction in Southern New England after Hurricane Diane in 1955, "the damage was a great as that done to the Ruhr in three years of fighting." A Sullivan's resident wrote that the hurricane was probably the most stressful experience of his life, including wartime service.[4]

Natural disasters stretch the capacity of government and emergency relief structures to respond.[5] We know less than we need to about the impact of disasters on people, because complex studies designed to assess the effects of disasters are difficult to plan and carry out. Practical and methodological problems in gaining access to victims, securing their cooperation, and avoiding skewed research results abound.[6] The kind of disaster research that can be done is limited by the low chance of a natural disaster occurring in a given location. The probability that a Hugo-force hurricane would strike the Charleston area in 1989, for example, had been calculated as a less than one percent probability.[7]

Sullivan's Island and the Isle of Palms are the first and second islands in the chain of barriers reaching north from Charleston Harbor. Predictions made a year earlier of the

[3]Lynn M. Alperin, *Custodians of the Coast: History of the United States Army Engineers at Galveston* (Galveston: U. S. Army Engineer District, 1977), 239; Jamie W. Moore and Dorothy P. Moore, *The Army Corps of Engineers and the Evolution of Federal Flood Plain Management Policy* (Boulder: University of Colorado, Institute of Behavioral Science, 1989), xii.

[4]Lee Kennett, *A History of Strategic Bombing* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1982), 184-187; Aubrey Parkman, *Army Engineers in New England: The Military and Civil Work of the Corps of Engineers in New England 1775-1975* (Waltham, Massachusetts: U.S. Army Engineer District, 1978), 191. This and other comments from residents were obtained in response to open-ended questions on the questionnaire described in the study.

[5]Paul Walker, *The Corps Responds: A History of the Susquehenna Engineer District and Tropical Storm Agnes* (Baltimore: U.S. Army Engineer District, n.d.), 11; Mississippi River Commission, *Improvement of the Lower Mississippi River and Tributaries, 1931-1972* (Vicksburg, Mississippi: Mississippi River Commission, 1972), 208-209.

[6]S. Soloman, "Research Issues in Assessing Disaster Effects," Richard Gist & Bernard Lubin, eds. *Psychosocial Aspects of Disaster* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1989), 330-335; C Piotrowski, "Use of the Semantic Differential Technique in Research on Disaster, A Methodological Note," *Psychological Reports*, 56, 527-530; B. Powell and E. Penick, "Psychological Distress Following a Natural Disaster: A One-Year Follow-Up of Flood Victims," *Journal of Community Psychology*, 11, 269-276; D. Ollendick and M. Hoffmann, "Assessment of Psychological Reactions in Disaster Victims," *Journal of Community Psychology*, 10 (1982), 157-167; G. C. Fogleman and V. Parenton, "Disaster and Aftermath: Selected Aspects of Individual and Group Behavior in Critical Situations," *Special Forces*, 38, No. 2 (1959), 129-135; E. Baker, E. Brigham, J. Paredes, & D. Smith, "The Social Impact of Hurricane Eloise on Panama City, Florida." Immediate Response Project, State University System of Florida, Sea Grant Program, Tallahassee: Florida State University (1976); P. Simpson-Housely, R. Moore, P. Larrain, & D. Blair, "Repression-Sensitization and Flood Hazard Appraisal in Carman, Manitoba," *Psychological Reports*, 50 (1982), 839-842; J. Mitchell, "Human Dimensions of Environmental Hazards: Complexity, Disparity, and the Search for Guidance," Andrew Kirby, ed., *Nothing to Fear, Risks and Hazards in American Society* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1990), 137; M. Smithson, "Ignorance and Disasters," *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters*, 8, No. 3 (1990), 207-235.

[7]W. Brinkmann, "Hurrican Hazard in the United States: A Research Assessment," *Program on Technology, Environment and Man*, Monograph #NSF-RA-E-75-007 (Boulder: Institute of Behavioral Science, 1975), 8.

effects of a high-magnitude hurricane on the Carolina coast were born out by Hugo.[8] No structure on Sullivan's Island escaped damage. Of 923 buildings, 59 were torn down or scheduled for demolition in the first year after the storm, and building permits totaling nearly $15.7 million were issued for another 600 structures.[9] By June 1990, nine months after Hurricane Hugo struck, few residential structures had been completely repaired or replaced, and, according to town officials, fewer than 40% percent of the island residents were living in their homes. Prior to the storm, the Sullivan's Island Post Office delivered mail to some 450 rural route addresses and 650 post office boxes. In June 1990, deliveries were going to 350 addresses and 500 boxes.

We conducted our survey of the experiences of Sullivan's Island residents in June 1990. To obtain complete coverage, we created a redundant mailing list by adding to the total of 850 rural route deliveries and post office boxes additional addresses drawn from the Sullivan's Island Town Council water-meter account and Charleston County Tax Maps. Questionnaires were mailed first class to names and addresses on a final list. After a two-week period, a second first-class mailing of follow-up letters and questionnaires went to names and addresses which had not responded. In all, we sent one or more questionnaires to 950 names, occupant addresses, and street numbers. A post-mailing inventory determined that of the 950 mailings only 876 went to valid addresses. Of this total, 242 questionnaires were unusable because they had been returned as undeliverable due to missing forwarding addresses or missing mail boxes, because the address represented multiple property owners, or because a resident had both a street address and a post office box. Our effective mailable list thus totaled 634 addresses, from which we received 274 completed forms, a response rate of 43.2%. A one-page cover letter to our questionnaire identified the authors as island residents conducting an academic study under a grant, informed readers that completing the questionnaire would require about 30 minutes of their time, promised confidentiality of individual responses, invited commentary, and asked if respondents would be willing to participate in follow-up interviews. Among other items, sections of the questionnaire covered demographics, stress effects, property loss and insurance coverage, and asked about residents' experiences.

Comparison of survey results with public records shows no statistically significant differences between the pre-storm island population and respondents who were island residents for the demographics such as age, sex, race, marital status, and number of people in the household. Comparison also shows no statistically significant differences between averages of the assessed value of property reported by respondent owners and county tax map data. Nor were there any statistically significant differences between the various levels of property damage reported by respondents in categories which lent themselves to comparison with a damage and recovery assessment completed a year after the storm. The absence of differences suggests that the questionnaire sample accurately portrays the

[8]B. Sill, P. Sparks, & E. Hayter, "Estimation of Damage That Could Have Been Inflicted If Hurricane Gilbert Had Made Landfall in South Carolina," Paper, Coastal Hazards Advisory and Mitigation Project, Clemson University (Clemson, 1988).

[9]*Sullivan's Island--Hurricane Hugo: One Year Later* (Berkeley-Charleston-Dorchester Council of Governments, Management and Planning Systems Program, 1990).

Sullivan's Island population, with one possible exception. Though there is no way to determine exactly the number of renters residing on the island just prior to the hurricane because not all rental units were recorded on town records, the fact that the questionnaire respondents were mainly island property owners, or year-round resident owners of family vacation or summer homes suggests that the pre-storm rental population was dispersed after the storm and may be slightly under-represented in the study.[10]

Many who responded were grateful that someone was taking time to ask about their problems. "Thanks so much for this questionnaire," one wrote. "This is an excellent survey," said another. And after the mailings people stopped us on the street to say thanks. But not all comments were flattering.

> This survey is incredibly slanted towards bad experiences. In my opinion the results will be biased. I get the feeling that you have definite expectations or a desired result. This is an example of very poor research.[11]

Nor were all the respondents enthusiastic about filling out a twelve-page questionnaire:

> This is the seventh survey I can remember. I've thrown the others out. I don't want to be someone's laboratory rat. I've been through enough and it continues. I only answered this because you were fellow residents. I would like to be more helpful but I am drained to the limit.

A hurricane's greatest impact is on property, and property ownership is deeply embedded in the fabric of American life, particularly the substantial long-term investments people make in homes and businesses. Widespread property loss has strong, lasting, and possibly devastating effects on communities and individuals.[12] To protect property, people buy insurance, most commonly fire, wind damage, or comprehensive homeowner policies. Insurance against flood damage, which is responsible for about 80 percent of the property

[10]Readers interested in a fuller presentation of the data and accompanying statistical analyses for this study should see Jamie W. Moore and Dorothy P. Moore, "Sullivan's Island, South Carolina, The Hurricane Hugo Experience: The First Nine Months," Working Paper #81, Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center, Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, January, 1993.

[11]We obviously disagree. To our knowledge, no one has ever done a comprehensive post-disaster study of an entire community such as this. In the absence of prior researc and in order to insure reliability in our study, many of the questions were adapted, by permission, from instruments or studies of stress changes where the needed integrity had been established already. Questions in an established scale can appear slanted because most of the answers sought are measurements of change from a baseline of normal attitudes, behavior, and feelings.

[12]Office of Technology Assessment, *The Effects of Nuclear War* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1979); Alexander H. Leighton, *The Governing of Men: General Principles and Recommendations Based on Experience at a Japanese Relocation Camp* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1945).

losses in the United States today, is relatively new, and, until recently, little was sold because residents outside the flood plain did not need it and those on the flood plain could not afford the high premiums. Except for the policies required by lending institutions who are bound by federal regulations, participation in the federally subsidized flood insurance program is not particularly high, even today.[13] People find filing insurance claims after a disaster extremely trying. Dealing with numerous cases of fraudulent filings (especially in automobile insurance claims) insurance companies have a strong incentive to limit exposures with precise language in policies and by rigidly reviewing claims.[14] Difficulties are compounded by few property owners making the extensive, pre-disaster preparations that would facilitate claims handling. As a result, disaster victims commonly find that they did not have enough insurance, or necessary coverage such as flood insurance, or are underinsured, or only learn after the fact about gaps in their coverage.[15]

Most Sullivan's Island residents had insurance of some sort, but only one policyholder in four said that before the storm he had a full or informative discussion about coverage with an insurance representative, and only one in five had been made fully aware of the distinction between coverage from wind damage and flood damage. Slightly more than a third of the policy holders had flood insurance coverage on their buildings, but only one in four had flood insurance for contents, which is sold separately. Two people out of every five said they did not know whether they lived in an A Zone (the federal description for areas prone to flooding) or the more dangerous V Zone (flooding plus wave action). Of every ten people responding to the survey, one reported no uninsured losses, three reported uninsured losses under $10,000, and four uninsured losses from $10,000 upwards. Settlements were complicated by the difficulties insurance companies faced in responding after the storm. One policyholder in five had to wait over a month to talk with an insurance company representative. More than half the respondents had to deal with more than one adjuster. A fourth said adjusters disappeared and were replaced without notification. More than a quarter of the people said they got different information from different adjusters. Identifying events which had severely affected their lives, more than one third of the people put dealing with insurance company representatives highest on their list. As a community problem, insurance-related stress ranked behind increased demands on one's time and problems in rebuilding one's home but ahead of the difficulty of dealing with the death of a loved one or friend. One policyholder in three coped by going over the head of an

[13]J. Rose, "The Mandatory Flood Insurance Purchase Requirement," *ABA Bank Compliance*, (Autumn, 1988), 23-29; Jamie W. Moore and Dorothy P. Moore, *The Army Corps of Engineers and the Evolution of Federal Flood Plain Management Policy* (Boulder: Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, 1989), 42, 49-50, 73-75; W. Petak, A. Atkisson, and P. Gleye, "Natural Hazards: A Building Loss Mitigation Assessment," Prepublication Draft Manuscript, Files, Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center, Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado; D. Sturgess and J. McHugh, "Flood Hazard Insurance: Requirements Imposed on Banks Extending Loans Secured by Real Property," *Real Estate Law Journal*, 16, 226-241.

[14]D. Anderson, "The Phony-Claims Drain," *Insurance Review*, (August, 1990), 20-23; A. Crawford, "The White Lie Syndrome," *Insurance Review* (August, 1991), 24-26; "What Hugo Taught Us," *Journal of American Insurance* (First Quarter, 1990), 1-12.

[15]K. Tierney, "The Social and Community Contexts of Disaster," Richard Gist and Bernard Lubin, eds., *Psychosocial Aspects of Disaster* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1989), 11-39; N. Arnell, "Insurance and Natural Hazards, A Review of Principles and Problems," Discussion Papers No. 23, Department of Geography, University of Southampton, Files, Natural Hazards Research and Information Center, University of Colorado; D. Federal, "The Federal Flood Program Is Ineffective," *National Underwriter*, 23 (February, 1987), 29-30.

adjuster to speak to an insurance company supervisor, one in six threatened to get legal assistance or go to the state insurance commission, and one in seven obtained the services of a professional engineer to substantiate storm damage claims.

Within four months, three out of every fours insurance claims on Sullivan's Island had been settled. Nearly half the policy holders responding said that they were satisfied or extremely satisfied with their settlements. But one policy holder in four was either neutral about the settlement or dissatisfied to some degree. More than a quarter said that they would not be compensated for major losses they thought were covered in their policies. Not surprisingly, dissatisfaction correlated strongly with the dollar amounts of property damage and uninsured loss. The fact that a third of the people said they had increased their coverage since the hurricane, most commonly between 10% and 20%, is, perhaps, a good measure of heightened awareness. The fact that more than a third of the residents said they had changed insurance companies since the hurricane probably is a good measure of difficulty with insurance companies.

The stressful insurance experiences provoked many comments. The most common was that policyholders needed more and better information. "Coverage should be thoroughly explained to homeowners," said one. "Make insurance agents sign off whether all elements of coverage were explained and offered when writing policies," suggested another. A few people said they had been deceived: "I was led to believe that I had replacement value when in fact, because the house was not my primary residence, I got much less," said one aggrieved writer. "Make the bad-faith statute clearly applicable to catastrophic situations and property insurance claims," suggested another. People recounted the inevitable occurrences of bureaucratic inefficiency, including this one:

> The person in charge of the claims office
> in [another state] did not seem to
> understand that my property was on an island;
> that we could not begin to salvage anything
> for over two weeks.

Comments also showed sympathetic understanding: "No insurance company in the world could have been adequately prepared." Overall, the experiences of many were summed up in the statement: "Dealing with insurance adjusters is the pits."

Geography, rain, and government decisions combined to differentiate the hurricane encounter of Sullivan's Island and Isle of Palms residents from experiences in the rest of the tri-county area. Sullivan's Island and the Isle of Palms are connected to each other by a fixed-span bridge over Breech Inlet and to the mainland by the Ben Sawyer drawbridge, an aging structure spanning the intracoastal waterway and known for its habit of jamming open at peak traffic periods. In the 1970s questions of easier access to the beaches and safer evacuation routes led to a highway department recommendation to replace the Ben Sawyer drawbridge with a fixed-span structure and widen the main thoroughfare across Sullivan's Island to four lanes. Sullivan's Island residents were happy with being slightly outside the

mainstream of an efficient transportation infrastructure because their erratic drawbridge helped keep the beach crowds down. (In 1988, *Parents Magazine* had rated the largely residential island with its restrictions on dividing lots and prohibitions against new commerce and condominiums as one of the four best places in the United States to raise children). When the state legislature enacted special enabling legislation to build a new bridge, the Sullivan's Island Township sued and won in the South Carolina Supreme Court a judgment that nowhere in the State could a bridge be built within township limits without the township's approval. That effectively checked construction on Sullivan's Island. Attention now shifted to the possibility of building a new fixed-span bridge from the mainland to the Isle of Palms, the alternative Sullivan's Island residents had favored and Isle of Palms residents had opposed all along. In time, the dream of a new connector matured into a highway department construction plan. For reasons similar to those which had motivated Sullivan's Islanders before, many on the Isle of Palms sharply opposed this plan. In an advisory referendum held barely a week before Hurricane Hugo hit, Isle of Palms residents only narrowly endorsed the connector construction.[16]

Municipal governments dealing with disaster traditionally face a tremendous overload of decision making and administrative work. They commonly perceive only a narrow range of options and often act on the basis of widespread myths of maladaptive behavior, such as the common but the inaccurate idea that widespread looting and price gouging are omnipresent post-disaster phenomena, and that without outside aid and government direction residents in stricken areas are helpless to avoid personal danger and injury or help themselves.[17] Partly because of the prevalent myths, authorities often exhibit little or no confidence in disaster-affected populations, restricting access to impacted areas long after the dangers to the population have ended.[18] This was the pattern after Hurricane Hugo. Mainland residents who got back to their homes and camped out were able to take advantage of the interval between hard rains to make makeshift roof repairs to protect against further water damage. But Hugo had cut the land connection between Sullivan's Island and the Isle of Palms and the mainland. The picture of the forlorn Ben Sawyer

[16]Informal post-hurricane polls showed decidedly higher levels of support on the Isle of Palms for the new connector. If bumper sticker observations are any measure, a number of people also still strongly opposed the connector construction.

[17]C. Rubin, M. Saperstein, and D. Barbee, *Community Recovery From a Major Natural Disaster* (Boulder: Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, 1985), 46; U. Rosenthal, "Human Factors Influencing Crisis Decision Making," *Emergency Preparedness Digest*, 16 (1989), 12-15; E. Auf Der Heide, *Disaster Response: Principles of Preparation and Coordination* (St. Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1989), 35-38; H. Fischer, "Hurricane Gilbert: The Media's Creation of the Storm of the Century," Working Paper #67, Natural Hazards Research and Applications Information Center, Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, 1989; R. Dynes and E. Quarantelli, "Images of Disaster Behavior: Myths and Consequences," Preliminary Paper No. 5, Ohio State Disaster Research Center, 1972, Files, Natural Hazards Research and Information Center, University of Colorado; K. Tierney, "The Social and Community Contexts of Disaster," Richard Gist and Bernard Lubin, eds., *Psychosocial Aspects of Disaster* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1989), 11-39.

[18]D. Mileti, T. Drabek, and J. Haas, *Human Systems in Extreme Environments: A Sociological Perspective* (Boulder: Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, 1975). People affected by disasters have myths too. When the national guard or other military units are called in to assist local governments, they assume that martial law has been imposed when, in fact, there is no known case of a disaster in the United States where a declaration of martial law has ever been made. D. Wenger, C. Faupel, and T. James, "Disaster Beliefs and Emergency Planning, Final Report to the National Science Foundation," Grant Number ENV77-10202 (1975), Files, Natural Hazards Research and Information Center, University of Colorado; W. Anderson, "Military Organizations in Natural Disaster," *American Behavioral Scientist*, 13 (1970), 415-422.

bridge, one end mired in the waterway and the other pointing vainly skyward, became a national symbol. As post-storm rains continued to savage property, the municipal governments of Sullivan's Island and the Isle of Palms barred people from returning to the barrier islands by water, and obtained national guard assistance to enforce the emergency decrees. Islanders, many not knowing whether their homes still stood, angrily protested the decisions in town meetings in neighboring Mt. Pleasant.

Nine months after the storm, Sullivan's Islanders divided sharply over the wisdom of this decision.[19] Slightly more than half the respondents felt that bringing in the national guard was a necessary measure; one third did not. Nearly two thirds said that the use of the guard to keep residents off the island interfered with their rights to return and examine property damage. Slightly over half were frustrated by the fact that they were prohibited from returning after the storm. Many were quite angry, with just under half reporting some measure of resentment toward the town for not letting citizens have more voice in decisions affecting their lives.

Written comments reflected the statistics. "I was very much in agreement with martial law on the island despite my desire to get there and survey the damage," said one. "Our town government failed us all," answered a critic. "The decision was absurd," agreed another, "thieves never could have taken or caused the loss I had because I could not get there." Harsh criticisms spared no officials. "We need to enforce constitutional right of access to one's personal property," one person wrote. "The National Guard was no help, stole some of my property. Lazy bastards should have been working to help residents," said another. For many, "dealing with the primary effects of Hugo, the actual destruction, was not nearly as frustrating as dealing with the total inability of local government to make rational decisions on behalf of residents' needs." Some intended to remember. Said one,

> Being held off the island at gunpoint was inhuman and a foolish action by people we elected. There were no dangerous snakes. I saw several national guardsmen smoking, which made me wonder about the propane danger. In all, I feel martial law was a serious stressor for all residents. I hope the voters don't forget when the elections draw near.

Statements of residents in support of the decisions of township authorities were equally intense.

> Repairs could not have been accomplished in the short time people were kept off the island.

[19]Questionnaire responses showed no statistically significant differences between the initial and retrospective responses for any of the questions about municipal government performance.

> It was necessary to see the total picture, not individual, personal needs. Officials were elected to represent people and are responsible for making decisions. Any failures can be dealt with in subsequent elections.

Two statements sum up the polarized islanders: "Nobody died," wrote a supporter of the government decision. "I will *never* evacuate again," warned a critic, "But I will have ammunition."

A substantial body of research confirms that disasters have a substantial effect on local communities and that disaster-impacted populations commonly exhibit characteristics that set them apart from others.[20] The impacts differ in intensity depending on demographics, social support systems, lost lives , and a host of moderators, including whether an individual feels some sense of control in the situation. But changes in feelings and behavior form a common denominator. Natural disasters affect health directly as the result of increasing physiological wear and tear on people undergoing prolonged events and indirectly as a consequence of changed patterns in individual behavior. None of the effects is predictable.[21]

Few respondents reported much stress on hearing evacuation warnings or displayed a high degree of concern about living on a barrier island before the storm or after. But more than two-thirds of the respondents reported high stress on their first return after the storm, and nearly six out of ten said Hugo had upset their lives. Islanders also felt that their experiences differed from those of people on the mainland; the feeling was common that mainland residents who had suffered less damage were insensitive to what had happened on the barrier islands. As with the questions relating to insurance difficulties, the degrees of dissatisfaction, frustration, and stress correlated with the dollar amounts of insured and

[20]H. T. Holmes and R. H. Rahe, "The Social Readjustment Rating Scale," *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 11 (1967), 213-218; T. H. Holmes and E. M. David, eds., "Methodology of Life Events," *Life Change Events Research 1966-1978, An Annotated Bibliography of the Periodical Literature* (New York: Praeger Publishing, 1984), 253-305; J. Johnson and I. G. Sarason, "Recent Developments in Research on Life Stress," V. Hamilton & D. M. Warburton, eds., *Human Stress and Cognition* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1979), 205-233; S. Kasal, "Pursuing the Link Between Stressful Life Experiences and Disease: A Time for Reappraisal," C. Cooper, ed., *Stress Research: Issues for the Eighties* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1983), 79-102; E. Cowen, "Person-Centered Approaches to Primary Prevention in Mental Health: Situation Focused and Competence Enhancement," *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13 (1985), 87-93; M Fairley, P. Langeluddecke, and C. Tennant, "Psychological and Physical Morbidity in the Aftermath of a Cyclone," *Psychological Medicine*, 16 (1986), 671-676; S. Gore, "Perspectives on Social Support and Research on Stress Moderating Processes," *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 8 (1987), 85-101; M. Krause, "Exploring the Impact of a Natural Disaster on the Health and Psychological Well-Being of Older Adults," *Journal of Human Stress*, 13 (1987), 53-69.

[21]Gore, "Perspectives on Social Support and Research on Stress Moderating Processes;" Fairley, Langeluddecke, and Tennant, "Psychological and Physical Morbidity in the Aftermath of a Cyclone;" Cowen, "Person-Centered Approaches to Primary Prevention in Mental Health: Situation Focused and Competence Enhancement;" (1985), 87-93; J. Phifer, D. Kaniasty, and F. Norris, "The Impact of Natural Disaster on the Health of Older Adults: A Multiwave Prospective Study," *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 29 (March 1988), 65-78; D. Mechanic, "Illness Behavior, Social Adaptation, and the Management of Illness," *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, (1977), 79-87; Federal Emergency Management Agency, "Behavior and Attitudes Under Crisis Conditions: Selected Issues and Findings," Final Report, FEMA Work Unit Number 4851A (1984), Files, Natural Hazards Research and Information Center; D. Mileti, T. Drabek, and J. Haas, *Human Systems in Extreme Environments: A Sociological Perspective* (Boulder: Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, 1975).

uninsured property loss, regardless of whether the property was one's primary residence, and the percentage of destruction to a home.

Responses to the open-ended questions and the spontaneous comments of people who filled out the questionnaire breathe life into the statistics. Few people found the hurricane inspirational. Statements about renewed religious faith or succeeding through adversity or realizing character development by hurricane were scarce, numbering barely a dozen. Upbeat comments about "taking it" and "bouncing back" were equally rare. One did manage to describe a hurricane adventure:

> Easily one of the most dramatic and exciting things that every happened to me. Winston Churchill remarked after Omdurman that it was exhilarating to have been shot at and missed. He was right.

Also few in number were the statements of desperation, but they were present. "Separated from wife, business partnership broken up, debt rising," said one. "Suicidal," said another. "Will life ever be the same?" a third asked. Several of the more fortunate residents understood what others were going through and felt guilty about it. One wrote, "I suffered less than my neighbors. This made me want to help others. I didn't want to have no answer when asked later, 'What did you do?'" When people wrote of lessons learned they reflected them through pain. Said one,

> I will never again feel as secure. I have lost faith in officials who think they know what is best for everyone. I can take care of myself better than anyone else can.

Another wrote, "I learned a lesson the hard way. I am not so tolerant now. I'm too nice and this results in getting stepped on too often." Most common were statements of apprehension: "I fear it will happen again;" or incredulity: "initially unbelievable" and irritation: "inconvenient as hell." There were any number of variations on the theme that life after the hurricane seemed, as one resident put it, "less purposeful, less optimistic, and less satisfying." Said another, "The recurring adjectives of feeling describe a thesaurus of misery: unsettled, frustrating, helpless." Wrote still another, "Feelings? Indifference, intolerance, suspicion, distrust, anxiety, everything that goes with a disaster." Stress and dread were omnipresent: "It will never go away." Said one typical respondent,

> There is a tendency to deny how much one has suffered. The anger, frustration, grief, and sense of violation and of loss can be compared

> to the aftermath of an assault. The emotional stress seems to go on and on.

Entrepreneurs in particular more than had their hands full dealing with the destruction to their establishments, rebuilding their businesses, and juggling the needs of employees, many of whom had their own range of problems. Not all losses were measured in dollars. Poetic phrases lamented, "It destroyed the large trees. Everything else can be replaced." "I would rather have lost my house than my trees," another one echoed. A young mother wrote, "I lost the first year of my baby's life dealing with this. I neglected pictures, keepsakes, and other family members." Said one islander, "My life is divided into 'before' and 'after' Hugo and will likely remain so for a long time." Another underlined the personal agony felt by many, "It was much easier to get over the death of [a spouse] than to get over Hugo."

In addition to shedding light on the common experiences of people in a disaster, the information in this study has a public policy application. Immediately after Hugo the biggest problem in the tri-county area was getting electrical power restored. Once that was accomplished, gasoline could be pumped, and the work of rebuilding could proceed. Consequently governments on the mainland concentrated on clearing the main streets so power trucks could get to the downed power lines. Most of the secondary streets and roads were cleared nearly as fast as the main streets, but not by government. Homeowners and residents, later supplemented by arriving volunteers, cut through the tangle of fallen trees and opened the roads in their neighborhoods. Americans are criticized for being too materialistic. But among their possessions are vehicles and tools: pickup trucks, yard tractors, and chain saws. The lesson is for government to allow able-bodied evacuated people to get back to their homes quickly. They swell the ranks of the cleanup army, they serve as the neighborhood police watch, and they fend for themselves, cooking out until power is restored, for example. They need not be treated like a refugee population.[22]

[22]For a discussion of current federal policies and suggestions for change see Moore and Moore, "The Hurricane Hugo Experience: The First Nine Months," 39-48.

MINUTES
South Carolina Historical Association
Annual Meeting - 1992

The sixty-second annual meeting of the South Carolina Historical Association convened at the Aiken Campus of the University of South Carolina on March 7, 1992. An estimated seventy-five members and guests of the Association attended the meeting. Following registration and coffee, the membership attended a rich offering of four morning programs beginning at 9:30 a.m.

Session I, chaired by Alexander Moore of the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, focussed on "Antebellum Southern Communities." Bruce Mactavish, University of Mississippi, presented "'O sir he is from South Carolina': Migration and the Establishment of Community: South Carolina and Mississippi as a Case Study." Peter McCandless, College of Charleston, discussed "How Various and Conflicting: Community Therapy for Insanity in Nineteenth Century South Carolina." Charles Joyner, Coastal Carolina Campus of the University of South Carolina, commented on the two papers.

Session II, chaired by Walter B. Edgar, Institute for Southern Studies at the University of South Carolina, was entitled "Alternative Methods of Teaching Undergraduate Southern History." William S. Brockington, Jr. of the Aiken Campus of the University of South Carolina presented "Teaching Southern History: A Thematic Approach" and Amy Thompson McCandless, College of Charleston, offered "The History of Mount Pleasant Project: Involving Students in Community History." A. V. Huff, Furman University, commented on the two papers.

Session III, chaired by Richard Golden, Clemson University, was entitled "The Quincentenary and South Carolina History: Issues and Sources for Secondary School Teachers." Margaret Walden, South Carolina Department of Education, presented "The Columbus Quincentenary: Issues, Meanings, and Resources"; Roberta VH. Copp, South Carolina Department of Archives and History offered "A Discovery, An Encounter, and An Exchange: The Spanish and English in South Carolina"; and Marcia G. Synnott, Columbia Campus of the University of South Carolina, discussed "The Quincentenary: An Opportunity to Discover Women's Contributions to South Carolina History." Elaine Lacy, Aiken Campus of the University of South Carolina, and James E. Sheehan, Aiken High School, offered comments. A lively discussion by all in attendance ensued.

Session IV, chaired by Constance B. Schulz, Columbia Campus of the University of South Carolina, was entitled "South Carolinians and the Communist Menace." Joseph Edward Lee, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, offered "South Carolina's Cold Warrior James P. Richards, Captain of America's International 'Fire Department' During the 1950s"; Joyce Johnston, Columbia Campus of the University of South Carolina, explained "Communism vs. Segregation: Evolution of the Committee to Investigate Communist Activities in South Carolina"; and Will Huntley, Governor's School for Science and

Mathematics, presented "Mendel Rivers: The Congressman Who Made the C-5A Fly." Comments on the papers were offered by Selden Smith, Columbia College.

Following the morning sessions the membership recessed for a luncheon at the Student Activities Center at USCA. Following introductory remarks by USCA Chancellor Robert Alexander, an excellent repast was provided. While members were enjoying dessert, Charles Lesser, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, introduced the luncheon speaker. Chester DePratter, South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology and Chair, Columbian Quincentennial Commission of South Carolina, presented an entertaining slide and talk program entitled "The Archaeology of Santa Elena: Spanish Outpost in South Carolina." President Val Lumans, Aiken Campus of the University of South Carolina, thanked the speaker for his talk. A short business meeting followed. The membership and financial status of the SCHA were discussed by Bill Brockington, Secretary/Treasurer. Departmental memberships as well as individual memberships would be solicited in the coming year. Charles Lesser was recognized for his hard work in providing an excellent program for 1991. Bill Brockington, Calvin Smith, Elaine Lacy, and Jim Farmer of USCA were thanked for the hospitality extended to the SCHA by their institution.

The Business Meeting followed. After President Lumans called the meeting to order, Bill Brockington, Secretary/Treasurer, presented the Treasurer's Report. The membership and financial status of the SCHA were discussed, and it was suggested that departmental memberships as well as individual memberships be solicited during the coming year. A proposed slate of 1991-1992 Officers and Members of the Executive Board was introduced, voted on, and approved by acclamation. The 1992-1993 officers are:

President - Charles H. (Chuck) Lesser, S.C. Archives
Vice President - Denis G. Paz, Clemson University
Secretary/Treasurer - Wm S. Brockington, Jr., USC at Aiken
Editor THE PROCEEDINGS - Peter W. Becker, USC at Columbia
At Large - Terry L. Helsley, Rock Hill School
At Large - Marcia G. Synnott, USC at Columbia

Charles Lesser was recognized for his hard work at providing an excellent program for 1992. Bill Brockington, Calvin Smith, Elaine Lacy, and Jim Farmer of USCA were thanked for the hospitality extended to the SCHA by their institution. Finally, the sixty-third annual meeting will be held at the South Carolina State Museum March 7, 1993. There being no further business, the sixty-second annual meeting of the South Carolina Historical Association adjourned for the final session of the day.

Session V, chaired by Alexia Jones Helsley, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, was entitled "Changes in the South Carolina landscape: Bright Leaf Tobacco and Hurricane Hugo." Eldred E. Prince, Jr., Coastal Carolina Campus of the University of South Carolina, offered "'Long Live the Queen': Bright Leaf Begins Her Reign"; Robert R.

Simpson, Coker College, explained "Our Voices Tell the Story: Raising Tobacco in South Carolina's Pee Dee"; and Jamie W. Moore, The Citadel, presented "Sullivan's Island and Hurricane Hugo: An Early Perspective." Comments on the papers were offered by Stephen O'Neill, Furman University.

Following this last session, gentle libations and delightful conversations were enjoyed in the Gregg-Graniteville Room of the USCA Library before the journey home.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT, 1992
South Carolina Historical Association

CHECKING ACCOUNT:

Balance, December 31, 1991 ----------	$ 538.27
Deposits, January 1 - December 31, 1992:	
Individual Memberships, SCHA Annual Meeting Fees, Departmental Memberships, Library Memberships ----------	$4939.00
Total ----------	$5477.27
Expenditures, January 1 - December 31, 1992:	
Luncheon ----------	$ 535.00
Luncheon Speaker 1992 Meeting ----------	$ 200.00
Printing Cost of The Proccedings ----------	$1764.00
Postage & Mailing ----------	$ 355.90
Membership Confederation of S.C. Local Historical Societies ----------	$ 50.00
USC-Aiken Printing & Supplies ----------	$ 125.00
Checks and Service Charges ----------	$ 21.21
Total ----------	$2425.66

GENERAL SAVINGS ACCOUNT:

The First Savings Bank ----------	$ 708.34
NCNB # 049 ----------	$1737.72
Total General Savings ----------	$2446.06

PROCEEDINGS PUBLICATION ENDOWMENT FUND:

NCNB # 050 ----------	$2427.82
NCNB # 051 ----------	$1489.56
Total Endowment Fund ----------	$3917.38

HOLLIS PRIZE ACCOUNT:

The First Savings Bank 219 ----------	$ 565.58
The First Savings Bank 235 ----------	$ 848.23
The First Savings Bank ----------	$ 279.55
Total Hollis Prize Account ----------	$1693.36

Respectfully Submitted,

William S. Brockington, Jr.
Secretary/Treasurer, SCHa
January 15, 1993

The South Carolina Historical Association supplies THE PROCEEDINGS to all its members. Beginning in 1935, every fifth number contains an index for the preceeding five years.